1972

What came after?: news diffusion and significance of the Boston massacre in six American colonies, 1770-1775.

Smith, Robert W.

University of Wisconsin

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/16438

WHAT CAME AFTER?
NEWS DIFFUSION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BOSTON MASSACRE IN SIX AMERICAN COLONIES, 1770-1775

BY

ROBERT W. SMITH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
(Journalism and Mass Communications)

at the
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Returning to school after a layoff of fourteen years was a traumatic experience for this career Marine officer. No amount of hard work on my part could have made the venture successful if it was not accompanied by considerable quantities of assistance and encouragement from others.

Credit for suggesting the subject of this study--the Boston Massacre--goes to Scott M. Cutlip. He had something different in mind in the beginning and was not directly involved in the final product, but without his initial thoughts, the topic would never have surfaced. The necessary research could never have been accomplished without the extensive and excellent microfilm collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. My thanks go particularly to the girls who "care and feed" the readers.

Several other professors deserve thanks, not only for their help with this thesis, but for assistance and inspiration along the way. One is Douglas C. Jones for reminding me that history should have "a story in it." John T. McNelly is another for remembering what it was like to be away from school for a long time, and saving me many

words by suggesting, early in the game, the use of tables for clarifying data contained in the study. If they don't do this, it's not his fault. And, my adviser, Harold L. "Bud" Nelson, both for his patient guidance and a standard of scholarly excellence, which will forever serve me as an example. Working under him has been not just a valuable experience, but a true privilege.

I must also thank the United States Marine Corps for providing the opportunity for me to come to the University of Wisconsin.

A special note of thanks I reserve for my family: my wife, Gloria, and my sons, Greg and Mike. Without the environment of love, patience, and understanding they have always provided, the whole effort would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN FOOTNOTES

BC	*Boston Chronicle*
BEP	*Boston Evening-Post*
BG	*Boston Gazette*
BNL	*Boston News-Letter*
BPB	*Boston Post-Boy*
EG	*Essex Gazette*
EJ	*Essex Journal*
MS	*Massachusetts Spy*
CC	*Connecticut Courant*
CJ	*Connecticut Journal*
NLG	*New London Gazette*
NYJ	*New York Journal*
NYM	*New York Mercury*
NYPB	*New York Post-Boy*
RG	*Rivington's Gazetteer*
PC	*Pennsylvania Chronicle*
PEP	*Pennsylvania Evening-Post*
PG	*Pennsylvania Gazette*
PJ	*Pennsylvania Journal*
PL	*Pennsylvania Ledger*
PP	*Pennsylvania Packet*
NI	*Norfolk Intelligencer*

VG(PD)	*Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon)
VG(R)	*Virginia Gazette* (Rind)
VG(P)	*Virginia Gazette* (Purdie)
SCAG	*South Carolina American Gazette*
SCG	*South Carolina Gazette*
SCCJ	*South Carolina Country Journal*

CHAPTER I

COMMUNICATING THE EVENTS OF REVOLUTION, 1763-1775

> On that night the formation of American Independence was laid.
>
> --John Adams

If one were to list the prominent events of the ten-year period immediately preceding the War for Independence, the Boston Massacre would surely be included. Famous persons in American history along with historians have generally attached considerable importance to the incident. Not only did John Adams speak the words quoted at the top of this page, but he also referred to the Massacre as "an event never yet forgiven by any part of America." Some years later Daniel Webster said, "From that moment we may date the severance of the British empire."[1]

Rarely, if ever, does a book or article embracing the date of March 5, 1770, fail to discuss some aspect of the killing of five citizens in the streets of Boston by British soldiers. In his history of journalism in America, Edwin Emery wrote that the Massacre illustrated perfectly Samuel Adams' formula for revolution.[2] Henry Hansen wrote in 1970 that "nobody in the colonies was allowed to forget the Boston Massacre,"[3] while Hiller Zobel thought it is "a

part, not only of our national history, but of our national mythology."[4] And contemporary Revolutionary historian David Ramsey said it fueled the fire of liberty and "kept it burning with an incessant flame."[5] As eminent a colonial historian as Edmund S. Morgan thought the incident called attention throughout the colonies to the threat of British troops quartered among the population.[6] Pursuing this theme, Philip Davidson said, "The Boston Massacre was the first major incident used to condemn the troops and the administration."[7] Commenting on the propaganda effort aimed at the lower classes, Arthur Schlesinger said the Whig leaders created the label "Boston Massacre" as a propaganda device in order to martyr the victims to the cause of liberty. To Schlesinger, "A casual street fight thus came to be regarded as a pre-meditated slaughter of innocents."[8]

These and other historians assign to this Boston event deep meaning for all the colonies without offering evidence to support that contention. Although few would argue that Boston led the agitation against Britain, this in itself is insufficient evidence to generalize the impact of any single event to all the colonies.

Only three books have been devoted exclusively to the Massacre. Of these, Frederic Kidder's, written in 1870, reproduces sources and documents used by the town to get its side of the story to England before that of the

Crown officials. It is heavily slanted to the Whig point of view in telling the story of the event itself. Henry Hansen concentrates on causal factors of the incident and their relationship to mob action in Boston. Hiller Zobel's 1970 work is a thoroughly documented treatment of the legal aspects of the incident as reflected in the trials of the soldiers. Fully half of Zobel's book traces political conflict in Boston in the 1760's resulting in the rise of public violence and the gradual disappearance of duly constituted authority. Drawing upon a variety of sources he presents the most accurate account of the incident.[9]

A few historians have looked in varying degrees at the problem of what was known about the Massacre outside of Massachusetts. Philip Davidson discusses it when illustrating various methods of propaganda used during the Revolution. In his treatment of newspapers, he depicts front-page coverage of the event in South Carolina. Arthur Schlesinger, in his study of colonial newspapers as propaganda vehicles, makes numerous references to the Massacre, but confines his discussion principally to the Boston papers with an occasional mention of New York and South Carolina.[10]

Although generally acknowledged by historians as one of the important events of the period, they have neglected the reporting of it. Such is not the case for other significant events of the same time frame. In his

Crown officials. It is heavily slanted to the whig point of view in telling the story of the event itself. Henry Hansen concentrates on causal factors of the incident and their relationship to mob action in Boston. Hiller Zobel's 1970 work is a thoroughly documented statement of the legal aspects of the incident as reflected in the trials of the soldiers. Fully half of Zobel's book treats political conditions in Boston in the 1760's resulting in the rise of public violence and the gradual disappearance of duly commissioned authority. Drawing upon a variety of sources he presents the most accurate account of the incident.[9]

A few historians have looked in varying degrees at the problem of what was known about the Massacre outside of Massachusetts. Philip Davidson discusses it when illustrating various methods of propaganda used during the Revolution. In his treatment of newspapers, he depicts front-page coverage of the event in South Carolina. Arthur Schlesinger, in his study of colonial newspapers as propaganda vehicles, makes numerous references to the Massacre, but confines his discussion primarily to the Boston papers with an occasional mention of New York and South Carolina.[10]

Although generally acknowledged by historians as one of the important events of the period, they have neglected the reporting of it. Such is not the case for other significant events of the same time frame. In his twenty-eight-year-old article, "The Newspaper Coverage of Lexington and Concord," Frank Luther Mott treated that occurrence in detail. Similarly, Schlesinger covered the newspaper propaganda effort following the Stamp Act.[11]

George Andrew's 1965 study of colonial news dissemination carried a case study of the Boston Massacre as an illustration of time and channels for news diffusion. His was the first and only attempt to systematically tell the story of news reporting of the event throughout the colonies. He dealt, however, only with the incident itself, and examined only newspapers.[12] Thus we find that little has been written about what the colonies outside of Massachusetts knew about the Massacre. Consequently there exists little support for historians' claims of importance to the colonies as a whole.

From this brief review of historical writing about the Boston Massacre emerges the two-fold purpose of this study: to determine, as far as possible, what was known about the Massacre throughout the colonies, and to estimate relative impact of information about the event in six of them. The Massacre will not be considered as an isolated event, but rather a continuing story embracing the incident itself, the trials and the series of annual commemorative events, which took place in and around Boston. The study stops at 1775, the beginning of open warfare.

The six colonies examined are Massachusetts,

Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and South Carolina. This selection was made on the basis of geography (two each from the north, south, and middle sections of the colonies), population (the six largest), and degree of political activity--high in each case.

The three aspects of the story are probed in the light of four channels of communication: newspapers, pamphlets, sermons, and committees of correspondence. Although other means of communication, such as broadsides, songs, plays, poems, cartoons, etc., may have been used, the record for them is relatively incomplete, and, with exception of the broadside, historians have assigned them lesser importance.[13]

A few brief explanations on style should be helpful to the reader. Because this is a historical study of an event during the American Revolution the reader's prior knowledge of the general historical context in which it occurred is presumed, and only limited reference will be made to it. In order that the "flavor" of quotations from colonial sources be retained they are reproduced intact. A standard label for political identification has been adopted. "Tory" refers to those persons and institutions which advocated retention of established ties with Great Britain. "Whig" refers to those which opposed the status quo and agitated for change. Additionally, short titles of newspapers and pamphlets are used in the text. Full titles

may be found in Appendix B and the Bibliography.

The importance of newspapers, pamphlets, the clergy, and committees of correspondence in informing the public and influencing their opinion has been well recognized, not only by historians, but by contemporaries of the period as well. In 1774 a Tory pamphleteer discussing development of public opinion said, "Handbills, News Papers, party Pamphlets, are the shallow and turbid Sources from whence they derive their Notions of Government."[14] In 1815 John Adams agreed, while taking a somewhat more optimistic view of the result:

> . . . The Revolution . . . was effected, from 1760-1775 . . . the pamphlets, newspapers in all the colonies, ought to be consulted during that period to ascertain the steps by which the public opinion was enlightened and informed. . . .[15]

In 1775 Tory Daniel Leonard, writing as "Massachusettensis," claimed importance for the newspaper and the clergy when he wrote:

> When the clergy engage in political warfare, they become a most powerful engine . . . What effect must it have had upon the audience to hear the same sentiments and principles, which they had read in the newspapers, delivered on Sundays from the sacred desk . . . from which they had been taught, from their cradles, to believe could utter nothing but eternal truths?

Later in the same pamphlet, when speaking about the effectiveness of committees of correspondence in Massachusetts, he complained of their composition saying they consisted of "the highest Whigs or at least there are Whigs among them." He believed that the committees were appointed

at town meetings when attendance was minimal, or if the meetings were full, ". . . the moderate men seldom speak, or act at all, when this sort of business goes on."[16]

Newspapers

Newspapers were chosen for the study, because they are generally accepted as the "chief means of formulating public opinion and stating radical ideas," and of persuading the colonies to unite. As Schlesinger said:

> Doubtless a fair overall judgment would be that although a multitude of factors from the Sugar Act onward pushed the colonists along the road to Independence, the movement could hardly have succeeded without an ever alert and dedicated press.

They were printed in every colony throughout the period by men who viewed their role as "ranging from the high purpose of uniting the colonies to the more mundane motive of earning a living."[17]

Most of the papers were weeklies, with some like the Boston Chronicle and Massachusetts Spy appearing bi-weekly. Toward the end of the period, the newly established Pennsylvania Evening Post came out three times a week. Some publications like the Boston Gazette, New York Journal, and South Carolina Gazette, to name a few, printed throughout the period. Others came and went. But all colonies had at least one for the duration, with the number climbing as high as eight in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania by 1775.[18]

Stories appearing in the papers came from a variety

of sources, most of which were outside the newspaper. Reporters, in the modern sense, were unknown. Original stories came from the pens of citizens with information to pass along or, as likely, a point of view to advocate. Printers themselves wrote little in their own papers. When they took up the pen it was usually to announce difficulties in obtaining material for the paper, explaining why they printed a story as they did, or to share their problems of production and distribution with their readers. For instance, in 1773 Ebenezer Watson apologized for poor print quality in his *Connecticut Courant*, explaining it was due to "worn types." And John Pinkney complained about the slimness of his *Virginia Gazette* in 1775, but expected to do better in the future, because "in a few weeks we expect to receive a fresh importation from Philadelphia."[19]

Printers had various methods for distinguishing their own writing. Thomas and John Fleet used italics set within brackets in their *Boston Evening Post*.[20] John Mein printed in italics in his *Boston Chronicle*, often introducing his notes with three asterisks arranged in an inverted pyramid. This was a favorite practice of Samuel and Ebenezer Hall in their *Salem Gazette*, as well. Several others, including Green and Watson in their *Connecticut Courant* used a cut of a hand with a finger pointing to the first word of their italicized message.

Pinkney's comment illustrates a second major source

of news stories for the colonial printer--other newspapers. The propensity of printers to clip stories from other newspapers as a means of newsgathering is well known. Most material was reproduced verbatim as clipped or with minimum editing. It is mainly because of this habit that diffusion of news stories can be traced through the colonies.[21]

Colonial printers usually produced a four-page newspaper on a regular printing day each week. If they had more material than four pages could accommodate, they either held it over until the next week or added a "Supplement" or "Postscript" to the current edition. Hardly ever did they advance a publication date regardless of when they received news of its importance.[22] One notable exception to this latter practice was in South Carolina. Peter Timothy's Gazette and the American General Gazette of Robert Wells often appeared in the form of "Supplements," "Postscripts," or "Additions" on other than normal printing days. This practice appeared keyed to arrival of ships in Charleston bringing papers from other colonies.[23]

Many printers "believed it was part of their public duty to print materials on all sides of a question, even when they ran counter to a particular publisher's own views."[24] At least they professed this view of their role in proposals for their newspapers, which generally appeared

on page one of their first editions. Although each used somewhat different words, John Mein expressed the substance of their feelings when starting his Chronicle in 1767 by saying, "Whenever any dispute claims general attention, the arguments on both sides shall be laid before the public with the utmost impartiality."[25]

Despite statements of fairness, printers found as the revolutionary movement deepened they could not maintain this impartial position. As feelings mounted during the period, printers either voluntarily took sides or were pressed into one political camp or the other, often to their disliking. Isaiah Thomas summed up their feelings thusly:

> One of my profession here must either be of one party or the other (he cannot please both) he must therefore incur the censure of the opposite party which, to incur censure and displeasure of any party or persons, though caressed and encouraged by others, is disagreeable to me.

The position of the printers was clear. Their newspapers would reflect partisan politics in the growing split between the colonies and Great Britain.[26]

Pamphlets

The most fully articulated political arguments of the Revolutionary leaders appeared in pamphlets. They were spacious enough to allow complete recapitulation of a point of view, which in many cases appeared first in another form; yet they were easily and cheaply produced. It was in

this form, according to Bernard Bailyn, that "much of the important characteristic writing of the American Revolution occurred." Their purpose was to persuade by explanation and description that political liberty in America was threatened. For Philip Davidson they expressed "the best thought of the day."[27]

Pamphlets were probably most effective north of Virginia. There a greater number of printers and booksellers and closer concentration of people permitted fuller and more rapid exchange of ideas. In 1774 a pamphlet describing colonial grievances with Great Britain circulated through the interior of Connecticut as a means of informing those who were "not under the best advantages for information from the newspapers and other pieces wrote upon the controversy." Thus pamphlets emerge as a favorite channel of communication during the period.[28]

Sermons

Sermons were chosen because of the importance of the clergy and the pulpit as communications outlets and influencers of opinion. Ministers were among the best educated and most widely traveled persons in the colonial society. Schooled in political literature as well as ecclesiastical, they were political persons despite the ethical problems this created for them. Their sermons were as often political discourses as religious preachings. They lectured not only on Sundays, but at public occasions this form, according to Bernard Bailyn, that "much of the important characteristic writing of the American Revolution occurred." Their purpose was to persuade by explanation and description that political liberty in America was threatened. For Philip Davidson they expressed "the best thought of the day."[37]

Pamphlets were probably most effective north of Virginia. There a greater number of printers and booksellers and closer concentration of people permitted fuller and more rapid exchange of ideas. In 1774 a pamphlet describing colonial grievances with Great Britain circulated through the interior of Connecticut as a means of informing those who were "not under the best advantages for information from the newspapers and other pieces wrote upon the controversy." Thus pamphlets emerge as a favorite channel of communication during the period.[38]

Sermons

Sermons were chosen because of the importance of the clergy and the pulpit as communications centers and influencers of opinion. Ministers were among the best educated and most widely traveled persons in the colonial society. Schooled in political literature as well as ecclesiastical, they were political persons despite the ethical problems this created for them. Their sermons were as often political discourses as religious preachings. They lectured not only on Sundays, but at public occasions such as elections, anniversaries of prominent events, and military musters. In New England they annually preached on general election day--the last Wednesday in May--and artillery election day when officers of the militia company were chosen. It was custom on these occasions to preach a "decent, serious and constructive" sermon on a political subject. The obligation to "fight sin" became a political as well as religious objective.[29]

Despite internal differences and reasons, the majority of the clergy in New England joined the Whig movement. In the South they played a less prominent part, but after 1774 increased their efforts. They were imbued with the concept of natural law--the idea that man lived under justice and equity which was God-given. They possessed an anti-monarchial spirit based upon the concept that people had the right to choose their own rulers and fix the bounds of their authority. Presbyterian church doctrine, for instance, asserted the right of majority rule and distinct self-governing entities. Where the layman went to John Locke, Milton, and Sidney for theories on government and a free society, so the clergy went to them for theories on religious tolerance and human understanding. The most radical "Dissenters" of the period were influenced by "radical Protestant church life." Thus, their religious teachings and political leanings intertwined.[30] Through the period they more and more preached a

right of resistance to acts of Great Britain, which they thought threatened people's liberty. It is not surprising, therefore, to find them as leaders in the Whig cause. Their feelings were perhaps well summed up as early as 1763 by Reverend Jonathan Mayhew:

> True religion comprised a love of liberty and of one's country and the hatred of tyranny and oppression; that civil liberty they cherished so deeply received its chief sanction from religious faith.[31]

Committees of Correspondence

Philip Davidson referred to committees of correspondence as ". . . the most important organization for dissemination of propaganda that was created throughout the entire period." They represented the end product of a series of extra-legal political organizations, which functioned in various capacities during the period. Founded in Massachusetts in 1772, they constituted a "powerful grassroots political organization" for the Whigs, functioning outside the colonial legislatures. Following their inception in Massachusetts, Virginia proposed, in 1773, that they become official in all the colonies. But, the system was not complete until summer, 1774.[32]

Forerunners of the formal system first appeared in 1764 at the time of the Sugar Act. By uniting the colonies in refusing to import certain articles of British manufacture, they hoped to bring economic pressure to bear upon England to repeal the act. During the controversy over the

Stamp Act colonial assemblies corresponded in order to form a concerted effort throughout the colonies against use of the stamps. Again, in 1768, in response to passage of the Townshend Acts, Whig-dominated assemblies acted by correspondence with each other to establish a united course of action against this latest economic and political threat. At that time Samuel Adams sent the Massachusetts Circular Letter throughout the colonies, accompanied by a series of letters from Massachusetts citizens to prominent persons in England demanding repeal of the Townshend duties. The Circular Letter appealed to the other colonies to add their protests to those of Massachusetts. Thus, continued use, over time, of this form of communication encouraged development of the formal system, which emerged after 1773 as tensions increased.[33]

Communications in the Colonies

Distribution of written word in the colonies was not easy. Any discussion of diffusion should be more meaningful if problems associated with communications during the period are understood. Road networks did not exist. Land travel was primarily by horseback, and no permanent bridges existed over any major stream in the colonies. As John Ringwalt said in his study of American transportation systems, "At the time of the American Revolution there was not a good road of considerable length in any part of this country." And, if road travel was bad

Stamp Act colonial assemblies corresponded in order to form a concerted effort throughout the colonies against use of the stamps. Again, in 1767, in response to passage of the Townshend Acts, Whig-dominated committees acted by correspondence with each other to establish a united course of action against this (what seemed) economic and political threat. At that time Samuel Adams sent the Massachusetts Circular Letter throughout the colonies, accompanied by a series of letters from Massachusetts citizens to prominent persons in England demanding repeal of the Townshend duties. The Circular Letter appealed to the other colonies to add their protests to those of Massachusetts. Thus, continued use, over time, of this form of communication encouraged development of the formal system which emerged after 1772 as [illegible].[13]

Communications in the Colonies

Distribution of written word in the colonies was not easy. Any discussion of difficulties should be more meaningful if problems associated with communications during the period are understood. Road networks did not exist. Land travel was primarily by horseback, and no permanent bridges existed over any major stream in the colonies. As John Ringwalt said in his study of American transportation systems, "At the time of the American Revolution there was not a good road of considerable length in any part of this country." And, if road travel was bad in the north, it was virtually non-existent in the south, with only a single road through extensive swamps connecting seacoast towns below Virginia.[34]

The postal service was the principal means by which written communications were delivered. In the north that consisted of the postal rider traveling between cities on horseback. His load was necessarily limited. Service between northern cities and the South was by ship, taking anywhere from two to five weeks between Boston and Charleston, South Carolina. Colonial printers were, in most cases, also postmasters. This provided them an advantage in distributing their printings through the postal system, but it could not increase the load-carrying capability of the postal rider or shorten delivery time.[35]

By modern standards the colonies were not in close contact with each other. Communicating events or spreading ideas was a difficult, slow process. A sermon had to be printed as a pamphlet, then sent through the colonies (usually in limited numbers) to be reprinted when and where another printer thought it offered a chance of selling.[36] Newspaper printers served a real "gatekeeping" function through their liberal use of scissors and paste. A news story had first to be written by an individual in one colony, supplied to and printed there in a newspaper and dispatched through a relatively slow postal system. It then had to survive an evaluating and editing process in

another colony by a different printer. To compound the difficult situation, another step was often inserted into the process. The story, in many cases, went through an intermediate location where it was reprinted. This, then, was the process by which written communications got from colony to colony. We shall see how it affected what information became available about the Boston Massacre.

Lacking our modern systems of rapid communications, much information diffused through conversation between individuals or within groups. Each city possessed numerous taverns, inns, and coffee-houses, where citizens gathered and discussed the news of the day. One historian has claimed the "political pot simmered and seethed" in them when people congregated to "read the latest news-sheets and fortify each others prejudices." Another student of the period asserted that "If the American Revolution was 'cradled' in any place, it was in the urban public houses." Although these assertions seem reasonable in the context of the times, little actual evidence exists to support them. Beyond generalizing about these institutions and associating some with political factions, historians have written little about the social and political role they played in colonial life.[37]

Questions, Significance and Limitations

This study is descriptive and comparative in nature, seeking to fill a gap in journalistic history

regarding news coverage of the Boston Massacre and to estimate relative impact of various media. Major questions for which it seeks answers are:

1) What printed material about the Boston Massacre diffused through the colonies?

2) In which channel of public communications did the Boston Massacre receive its fullest coverage?

3) Is the credit which Schlesinger gave to newspapers as the principal vehicle for fomenting revolution valid in the case of the Boston Massacre? He said:

> Of these many ways of kneading men's minds, none, however, equaled the newspapers . . . they influenced events both by the reporting and abetting of local patriot transactions and by broadcasting kindred proceedings in other places. The press, that is to say, instigated, catalyzed and synthesized the many forms of Whig propaganda and action. It trumpeted the doings of Whig committees, publicized rallies, and mobbings, promoted partisan fast days and anniversaries, blazoned patriotic speeches and toasts, popularized anti-British slogans, gave wide currency to ballads and broadsides, furthered the persecution of Tories, reprinted London news of the government's intentions regarding America and, in general, created an atmosphere of distrust and enmity that made reconciliation increasingly difficult. Besides, the newspapers dispensed a greater volume of political and constitutional argument than all the other media combined. . . .[38]

4) What central themes did the information which diffused about the Massacre contain?

5) To what extent were the communications pro-Tory, pro-Whig, or neutral in their manifest sources and their apparent purpose?

By the answers to these questions the study probes significance and impact on the basis of what and how much

information about the Massacre public communications diffused throughout the colonies, and any response shown by each to knowledge of the affair--again as displayed in the media.[39]

Although not intended as an investigation of printing habits and procedures of the colonial newspaper publisher, the study provides some insight into this subject. By tracing news stories back to their original Boston sources, the study shows whether printers' sources matched the political leanings of their newspapers as established by historians.

Three basic limitations arise from the structure of the study and research procedures used:

1) It does not examine interpersonal communications about the event, except as reference was found in the sources consulted. To accomplish this would require a monumental effort of sifting through diaries, papers, archives, and letters in collections throughout the country. This study is limited to information carried through public communications channels, and uses materials available at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin or through inter-library loan.

2) Only a limited attempt has been made to fit this communications study into the political and social context of each colony examined. A basic question of why the Massacre impacted as it did is only partially answered.

3) With the exception of a few stories about the incident itself, the study does not show intermediate sources of newspaper accounts--that is, if a story originated in Boston and subsequently appeared in New York and South Carolina, the study does not determine whether the South Carolina printer got the story from the New York paper rather than the Boston one. More will be said about this in the suggestions for further study contained in Chapter VII.

A Note on Propaganda

Historian Richard Buel, Jr., says that any discussion of the American Revolution involves a "rich multiplicity of interpretations" which has "helped to illuminate the complexity"of the subject, but from time to time reaches a point where it "ceases to enlighten and merely creates confusion."[40]

An example, germane to this study, involves argument among historians over motives of Revolutionary leaders. On one side lies the position of Philip Davidson and Arthur M. Schlesinger, that Revolutionary rhetoric contained in pamphlets, sermons, newspapers, etc., was "propaganda"--a contrived effort on the part of a small group of radical leaders to manipulate public opinion to their ends. And that these ends were not shared by a majority of the population. Thus, Schlesinger says, "The stigmatizing of British policy as 'tyranny,' 'oppression,'

3) With the exception of a few words about the incident itself, the study does not show interrelationships of newspaper accounts—that is, if a story originated in Boston and subsequently appeared in New York and South Carolina, the study does not determine whether the South Carolina printer got the story from the New York paper rather than the Boston one. More will be said about this in the suggestions for further study contained in Chapter VII.

A Note on Propaganda

Historian Richard Buel, Jr., says that the discussion of the American Revolution involves a "rich multiplicity of interpretations" which has "helped to illuminate the complexity" of the subject, but from time to time reaches a point where it "ceases to enlighten and merely creates confusion."[19]

An example, germane to this study, involves argument among historians over motives of Revolutionary leaders. On one side lies the position of Philip Davidson and Arthur M. Schlesinger, that Revolutionary rhetoric contained in pamphlets, cartoons, newspapers, etc., was "propaganda"—a contrived effort on the part of a small group of radical leaders to manipulate public opinion to their ends. And that these ends were not shared by a majority of the population. Thus, Schlesinger says, "The stigmatizing of British policy as 'tyranny,' 'oppression,' and 'slavery' had little or no objective reality, at least prior to the Intolerable Acts, but ceaseless repetition of the charge kept emotions at fever pitch."[41]

Countering this concept is Bernard Bailyn, who believes the same rhetoric reveals that the colonists felt "real fears, real anxieties, a real sense of danger." They wrote and spoke, not out of "desire to influence by rhetoric and propaganda the inert minds of an otherwise passive populace," but as an expression of true belief. His difference with Davidson and Schlesinger lies in his rejection of the Revolutionary writers as persons engaged in an attempt to manipulate the public toward hidden ends, often with false messages.[42]

But, Bailyn does not argue that the writers had no intent to persuade. On the contrary, he says their purpose was to do so.[43] Bailyn, Schlesinger, and Davidson thus agree that the writers, regardless of their degree of honesty and openness, were trying to persuade people to oppose Great Britain's attitudes and measures.

Deep motive, while posing a significant historical problem, is not the concern of this study. It is, instead, to describe the diffusion of communications about the Boston Massacre in an attempt to assess historians' claims that it was an important event in the move toward independence. The study examines these communications as an effort to inform and persuade, because it was the

communications which diffused, not the honesty or motive of the writer. Persons in other colonies could only know what they were told about the event. Their knowledge and opinion of it would largely be formed by the information which they received.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1] Both Adams quotes and the Webster quote appear in Frederic Kidder, History of the Boston Massacre (Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell, 1870), p. 3.

[2] Edwin Emery, The Press and America (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 98. Emery says Adams' formula was: (1) justify the cause advocated, (2) advertise the victory, (3) arouse the masses, (4) neutralize logical and reasonable argument, and (5) phrase all issues in black and white.

[3] Henry Hansen, The Boston Massacre (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1970), p. 175.

[4] Hiller Zobel, The Boston Massacre (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1970), p. 4.

[5] David Ramsey, The History of the American Revolution, Vol. I, p. 91, cited by Philip Davidson, Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), p. 196.

[6] Edmund S. Morgan, The Birth of the Republic, 1763-1789 (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1956), pp. 47-49.

[7] Davidson, Propaganda, p. 150.

[8] For "martyr" see Arthur M. Schlesinger, Prelude to Independence, Vintage Books (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 23, citing Kidder, History. For "street fight" see Schlesinger, ibid.

[9] Zobel, Massacre, pp. 180-205. His balanced account draws mainly from the pro-Whig pamphlet, A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre . . . (Boston, 1770), the pro-Tory pamphlet, A Fair Account of the Late Unhappy Disturbance At Boston . . . (London, 1770), and testimonies of witnesses at the murder trials of the soldiers contained in L. Kinvin Wroth and Hiller B. Zobel (eds.), The Legal Papers of John Adams, Vol. 3 (New York: Atheneum, 1968).

[10] Davidson, Propaganda, addresses and sermons, pp. 196-98, broadsides, p. 222, newspapers, pp. 234-35; Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 109, 117, 124, 126, 135-36.

[11] Frank Luther Mott, "The Newspaper Coverage of Lexington and Concord," *New England Quarterly*, XVII (December, 1944), 489-505; Arthur M. Schlesinger, "The Colonial Newspapers and the Stamp Act," *New England Quarterly*, VIII (March, 1935), 63-83.

[12] George S. Andrew, Jr., "News Dissemination in Colonial America, 1745-1775" (unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965). The several errors in Andrew's case study will be pointed out later.

[13] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, Chap. II, and Davidson, *Propaganda*, Chaps. X-XIII. Davidson believed the Whigs made extensive use of the broadside for reaching lower classes with "inflammatory propaganda." He thought it a highly effective means of political agitation used extensively after 1770. See *ibid.*, pp. 218-20.

[14] *A Letter From A Virginian . . .* (New York, [1774]), p. 6. This pamphlet may have been written by the Tory minister, Jonathan Boucher. See Thomas R. Adams, *American Independence* (Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press, 1965), p. 98; hereafter cited as Adams, *Bibliography*.

[15] Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 1815, in Charles F. Adams, *The Works of John Adams*, Vol. X (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1856), pp. 282-83.

[16] Daniel Leonard, *Origin of the American Contest . . .* (New York, 1775), pp. 21-22, 48.

[17] Merrill Jensen, *The Founding of a Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 99; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 285; Mary Ann P. Yodelis, "Boston's Second Major Paper War" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971), pp. 51-58.

[18] Clarence Brigham, *History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820*, Vols. I-II (Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1947), is single best source for general information of this sort.

[19] CC, July 27, 1773, p. 1; VG(R), April 13, 1775, p. 2.

[20] Yodelis, "Paper War," p. 54.

[21] Mott, "Lexington and Concord," p. 490; Merrill Jensen, *The New Nation*, Vintage Books, Caravelle (ed.) (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 430. Procedure for tracing diffusion through newspapers, as well as discussion

of research methods used for all communications channels appears in Appendix A.

[22] Mott, *ibid.*, pp. 491-92.

[23] This practice will be discussed further in following chapters.

[24] Jensen, *New Nation*, p. 430.

[25] Quoted in Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 104.

[26] Quoted in Clifford K. Shipton, *Isaiah Thomas* (Rochester, N. Y.: Leo Hart, 1948), p. 22. A notable exception was the *Boston Evening Post*, which maintained a neutral position throughout the period. See Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 100-16. The political position of all papers included in this study will be identified in succeeding chapters.

[27] Bernard Bailyn (ed.), *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 3-4, and Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 19; Davidson, *Propaganda*, pp. 209-10.

[28] Homer L. Calkin, "Pamphlets and Public Opinion during the American Revolution," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXIV (1940), 42; Ebenezer Baldwin, *. . . An Appendix, Stating . . . Grievances the Colonies Labor under . . .* (New Haven, /1774/), p. xiv.

[29] Alice Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* (Durham, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1928), pp. 3-7; Bernard Bailyn, "Religion and Revolution," in Vol. IV of *Perspectives in American History*, ed. by Bailyn and Donald Fleming (4 vols.; Harvard University: Charles Warren Center, 1970), pp. 111, 114-20; John W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1860), p. xxvi; Alan E. Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 12-15.

[30] Baldwin, *Clergy*, p. 83; Heimert, *Religion*, Chap. VII; Davidson, *Propaganda*, p. 207; Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina under the Royal Government, 1719-1776* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1899), p. 17; William Breed, *Presbyterians and the Revolution* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1876), pp. 29-30; Thornton, *Pulpit*, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv; C. H. Van Tyne, "Influence of the Clergy, and Religious and Sectarian

Forces, on the American Revolution," American Historical Review, XIX (October, 1913-June, 1914), 49-52; Staughton Lynd, Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution, Vintage Books (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 24-25.

[31] Baldwin, Clergy, p. 83; Van Tyne, "Clergy," 48. For a different opinion of Mayhew's commitment to Whig principles, see Heimert, Religion, pp. 290-91. Heimert thought him "reluctant" and felt he might not have been a leader had he lived into the later part of the period.

[32] Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 59-62; Jensen, Founding, pp. 411, 415-24; E. D. Collins, "Committees of Correspondence of the American Revolution," American Historical Association, Report for 1901, I (1901), 243-71, is an old but valuable survey of the subject. Hugh M. Flick, "The Rise of the Revolutionary Committee System," in Whig and Tory, Vol. III of The History of the State of New York, ed. Alexander C. Flick (10 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), provides a summary of various types of committees which existed in the period. Richard D. Brown, Revolutionary Politics in Massachusetts (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970) is the newest and most complete work on committees of correspondence in that colony.

[33] Page Smith, John Adams, Vol. I (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1962), p. 73; Jensen, Founding, pp. 123, 422; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 49-50.

[34] Andrew, "News Dissemination," p. 4, pp. 15-16 quoting John Ringwalt, Development of Transportation Systems, p. 23.

[35] Andrew, ibid., pp. 11, 18, 146.

[36] Calkin, "Pamphlets," 27-28; Adams, Bibliography, pp. xi-xiii.

[37] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 33; Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt (1st ed.; New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 358-59; Samuel A. Drake, Old Boston Taverns and Tavern Clubs (Boston: W. A. Butterfield, 1917), and Annie H. Thwing, The Crooked and Narrow Streets of Boston, 1630-1822 (Boston: Marshall Jones and Company, 1920), are examples of the few works done on the subject.

[38] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 45-46.

[39] In a further attempt to assess significance and impact of the Massacre, thirty-six histories of the

Forces, on the American Revolution," American Historical Review, XIX (October, 1913-June, 1914), 49-51; Staughton Lynd, Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution. Vintage books (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 24-25.

[31] Bailyn, Origins, p. 43; Van Tyne, "Clergy," 49. For a different opinion of Mayhew's commitment to Whig principles, see Heimert, Religion, pp. 290-91. Heimert thought him "reluctant" and felt he might not have been a leader had he lived into the later part of the period.

[32] Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 49-52; Jensen, Founding, pp. 411, 415-36; E. D. Collins, "Committees of Correspondence of the American Revolution," American Historical Association, Report for 1901, I (1902), 243-71, is an old but valuable survey of the subject. Hugh M. Flick, "The Rise of the Revolutionary Committee System," in Whig and Tory, Vol. III of The History of the State of New York, ed. Alexander C. Flick (10 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), provides a summary of various types of committees which existed in the period. Richard D. Brown, Revolutionary Politics in Massachusetts (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970) is the newest and most complete work on committees of correspondence in that colony.

[33] Page Smith, John Adams, Vol. I (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1962), p. 87; Jensen, Founding, pp. 123, 423; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 49-50.

[34] Andrews, "Boston Merchants," p. 4; pp. 13-16 quoting John [illegible], [illegible] Systems, p. 15.

[35] Andrews, Ibid., pp. 11, 12, 14.

[36] [illegible], "Pamphlets," 17-32; Adams, [illegible], pp. xl-xlii.

[37] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 11; Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), pp. 358-59; Samuel A. Drake, Old Boston Taverns and Tavern Clubs (Boston: W. A. Butterfield, 1917), and Annie H. Thwing, The Crooked and Narrow Streets of Boston, 1630-1822 (Boston: Marshall Jones and Company, 1920), are examples of the few works done on the subject.

[38] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 40-45.

[39] In a limited attempt to assess significance and impact of the [illegible], thirty-six selection of the

colonies included in the study were examined. With the exception of those of Massachusetts, none mentioned reaction to the event, while they all discussed impact of other important events of the period, such as the Stamp Act, Townshend Acts, non-importation, the Boston Tea Party, and the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

[40] Richard Buel, Jr., "Democracy and the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d ser., XXI (January, 1964), 165.

[41] Davidson, Propaganda, p. xv; Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 20, 34.

[42] Bailyn, Pamphlets, p. ix; Gordon S. Wood, "Rhetoric and Reality," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d ser., XXIII (January, 1966), 3-32, presents a summary of the differing points of view, accompanied by suggestions for overcoming the problem.

[43] Bailyn, Ideological Origins, pp. 18-19.

CHAPTER II

NEWSPAPERS REPORT THE MASSACRE: SPRING, 1770

Because the newspapers contained so much material about the Massacre and treated each aspect of the event differently, it is necessary to devote three chapters to the story they told. The role played by sermons, pamphlets, and committees of correspondence in relating the Massacre tale will be discussed separately.

Background

In May, 1767, the British Parliament passed the Townshend Acts, three pieces of legislation named for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Charles Townshend. These acts emphasized British sovereignty (particularly Parliament's) over the colonies, thereby reversing some long-held policies regarding relations between the mother country and America. The Acts suspended the New York Assembly, imposed a revenue measure upon the colonies, and created an American board of customs. By suspending New York's assembly, Parliament took the power of calling and dissolving colonial legislatures away from the Royal governors and vested it in itself. The Revenue Act reversed a long-standing mercantilist policy encouraging British imports

CHAPTER II

NEWSPAPERS REPORT THE MASSACRE: [illegible], 1770

Because the newspapers contained so much material about the Massacre and treated each aspect of the event differently, it is necessary to devote three chapters to the story they told. The role played by newspapers, pamphlets, and committees of correspondence in relating the Massacre tale will be discussed separately.

BACKGROUND

In May, 1767, the British Parliament passed the Townshend Acts, three pieces of legislation named for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Charles Townshend. These acts emphasized British sovereignty (particularly Parliament's) over the colonies, thereby reversing some long-held policies regarding relations between the mother country and America. The Acts suspended the New York Assembly, imposed a revenue measure upon the colonials, and created an American board of customs. By suspending New York's Assembly, Parliament took the power of calling and dissolving colonial legislatures away from the royal governors and vested it in itself. The Revenue Act reversed a long-standing mercantilist policy encouraging British imports into the colonies by imposing import duties on British goods such as glass, painters' colors, paper, and tea. Lastly, a customs board was established in Boston with powers to administer and enforce all customs regulations in the colonies--a function previously performed in England.[1]

To say the Townshend Acts were unpopular in the colonies is to understate the case. They met strong resistance. Of the Revenue Act, John Dickinson, writing in his widely circulated series, "Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania," said it had the single purpose of extracting money from the colonies under the guise of regulating trade--a departure from the time-honored principle of regulation only. To counter it, and attempt to force repeal of the Townshend Acts, Whig groups throughout the colonies pressed for and obtained, in the spring of 1768, a policy of non-importation of British goods.[2]

In Boston, seat of anti-British sentiment in the colonies, reaction to establishment of the customs board included mob violence and threats of mob violence against members of the board. Following capture by the customs officials of John Hancock's sloop *Liberty* on June 10, 1768, mob rioting forced the commissioners to seek safety in Castle William, an island fort in Boston harbor. There they remained for months under threat of physical harm from the Whig mob.[3]

In the midst of these growing tensions, four

regiments of British troops came to Boston in the fall of 1768 under orders of General Thomas Gage, British military commander in America. Lord Hillsborough, colonial secretary, directed Gage's action from England. Stationing British troops in the colonies was not a new event. They had been in America for years, having fought a major war there from 1759 to 1763 to prevent French encroachment into North America. Following the French and Indian War, however, they remained in the colonies, ostensibly to guard the frontier against Indians and any lingering French threat. They were quartered in some twenty-six places throughout the colonies--mostly outposts or small communities like Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Niagara, Pensacola, and some in South Carolina. But with increasing tensions the soldiers moved into the major cities of New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, and finally, Boston. Whig factions among the colonists felt they were there, not as protection, but to support functions of the British officials by terrifying the people into compliance with unjust laws.[4]

From the time of their arrival in Boston, the British soldiers created traditional frictions associated with troops living among civilians. They failed to adhere to customs and traditions of the city; shop lifted, brawled, and insulted and seduced the local women. The populace responded with insults and endless little assaults

with sticks, stones, and, in the winter, snowballs. None felt the threat more than Samuel Adams, who felt the soldiers' arrival ended all possibility of reconciliation with Britain. John Adams marked his cousin's determination for independence from the date of that arrival.[5]

Whig leaders in Boston, headed by Sam Adams, drummed up hate against the British troops through a newspaper campaign waged between October, 1768, and July, 1769. They popularized any item reflecting unfavorably upon troop behavior in the "Journal of Occurrences." This feature ran regularly in John Holt's New York Journal under agreement between Whig leaders in New York and Boston. Written in the latter city by various prominent Whigs including Adams and town clerk William Cooper, each installment of the "Journal" was printed two weeks later by Holt. It then was reprinted in the Boston Evening Post two months after its New York appearance. This was probably a tactical maneuver designed, according to one historian, to inflame the emotions of the Boston populace long after details of the incident were too dim to be accurately recalled. Lieutenant Governor Thomas Hutchinson claimed the townspeople were willing to accept them as printed.[6]

With dislike running high against both soldiers and customs officials, two unrelated incidents occurred within two weeks prior to the Massacre which set up the final confrontation. On Tuesday morning, February 22, a group of

boys mocked four Boston merchants, accused of ignoring non-importation, by displaying their names on a poster attached to a large wooden head. The boys paraded this effigy before the house of one of the businessmen. Ebenezer Richardson, who lived next door and was thought to be in the pay of the customs officials as an informer, attempted to destroy the display. Failing, he retreated, in the face of taunts, into his house, got a gun and fired upon the boys. His shot killed Christopher Snider, and wounded several others. Richardson was arrested and charged with murder. Also charged was George Wilmot, who was found inside Richardson's house. Wilmot was also thought to be associated with the customs commissioners.[7]

The Boston press labeled the incident a "barbarous Murder attended with _many_ aggravating Circumstances." The _Boston Gazette_ and the _Evening-Post_ coupled a gory description of the wounds of the victims with an account of the violence of the attack. The "Circumstances" alluded to was tyranny in the form of customs service domination of a peaceful populace.[8] This story diffused throughout the colonies, later to be linked with the Massacre as a basic theme. A subsequent denial by the customs officials of any connection with either Richardson or Wilmot appeared in the Boston press, but was later ignored in favor of continued coverage of Snider's funeral and fate of the accused murderers.[9]

During the week preceding the Massacre, which occurred on a Monday night, several arguments and fights broke out between soldiers of the 29th Regiment and workers at John Gray's ropewalk. These battles, involving up to thirty or forty soldiers and about a dozen ropewalkers, heightened tension between the soldiers and the town to the point where little was required to spark the disaster which occurred three nights later. The *Boston Evening-Post* and the *News-Letter* carried stories of these affairs, showing the soldiers as the aggressors. The *Evening-Post* story appeared the afternoon of March 5, along with an account of Snider's funeral. Thus, the aggressive nature of the soldiers, coupled with their basic incompatibility with the townspeople, was displayed in the press on the day of the Massacre.[10]

It was this constant friction between the soldiers and the town, especially among the lower economic classes, that culminated in the incident of March 5, 1770, when a group of eight soldiers of His Majesty's 29th Regiment of Foot fired upon the townspeople in front of the customs house in King Street, killing five and wounding several others. One can readily believe, as did John Adams, that hate, "systematically pursued for months . . . between the lower Class and the Soldiers," created the atmosphere for the Massacre.[11] This is not to imply that the Whigs, who felt so negatively about the soldiers' living among them, During the week preceding the massacre, which occurred on a Monday night, several arguments and fights broke out between soldiers of the 29th Regiment and workers at John Gray's ropewalk. These battles, involving up to thirty or forty soldiers and about a dozen ropewalkers, heightened tension between the soldiers and the town to the point where little was required to spark the disaster which occurred three nights later. The Boston Evening-Post and the News-Letter carried stories of these affrays, showing the soldiers as the aggressors. The Evening-Post story appeared the afternoon of March 5, along with an account of Snider's funeral. Thus, the aggressive nature of the soldiers, coupled with their basic incompatibility with the townspeople, was displayed in the press on the day of the massacre.[10]

It was this constant friction between the soldiers and the town, especially among the lower economic classes, that culminated in the incident of March 5, 1770, when a group of eight soldiers of His Majesty's 29th Regiment of Foot fired upon the townspeople in front of the Custom House in King Street, killing five and wounding several others. One can readily believe, as did John Adams, that here, "systematically pursued the contests . . . between the lower Class and the Soldiers," created the atmosphere for the massacre.[11] This is not to imply that the Whigs, who felt so negatively about the soldiers' living among them, wanted anyone to die. Who was at fault in the actual shooting may still be debated, but for purposes of this study is of little consequence. Of importance is what information circulated and where. Regardless of what happened or who was really to blame, persons in the other colonies could only know what they were told about the incident. With this in mind, we may now look at the story related by the newspapers.

Massachusetts

John Main printed a good newspaper by colonial standards. Typographically the Boston Chronicle was the best in Boston at the time--if not in all the colonies. Originally founded as an impartial or neutral paper, the Chronicle became a Tory supporter following personal attacks against Main by the Whigs for his refusal to sign the non-importation agreement.[12]

Because the Chronicle published on Thursdays, its March 8th issue was one of two Boston papers to report first the events of the night of March 5. In a half-column account beginning "For some days bye-past there have been several affrays between the inhabitants and the soldiers quartered in this town," the Chronicle gave a brief summary of the facts of the incident, as then known, and a list of the casualties. It finished by reporting the actions of Hutchinson and Lieutenant Colonel Dalrymple.

commander of the 29th Regiment, in withdrawing British troops from the town subsequent to the affair. Mein followed the account with this italicized note, explaining why he did not provide more information: "We decline at present giving a more particular account of this unhappy affair, as we hear the trial of the unfortunate prisoners is to come next week."[13] Eleven days later the Chronicle made its only other reference to the incident with a one-sentence announcement of withdrawal of the 14th and 29th Regiments from the city to Castle William.[14]

Also on March 8, Richard Draper's pro-Tory Boston News-Letter printed a one-column neutral story of the Massacre. The News-Letter was the oldest newspaper in Boston, and for many years printed for the governor and his council. Draper set off the top of his story column with a row of large black dots. His lead consisted of a long sentence apologizing for not printing a fuller account, explaining that "A number of Gentlemen are collecting Evidences of the whole Transactions, as soon as these are done, an Account will be drawn up and Published in the Papers." Then followed a factual story of the incident without placing blame for the shooting. This excerpt shows Draper's attempt at fairness: "Soon after, the Word Fire! was heard, upon which one Gun went off, in a Second or two of Time one or two others. . . ." The account listed the dead and wounded. It ended with three short paragraphs commander of the 29th Regiment, in withdrawing troops from the town subsequent to the affair. Mein followed the account with this italicized note, explaining why he did not provide more information: "We decline at present giving a more particular account of this unhappy affair, as we hear the trial of the unfortunate prisoners is to come next week."[13] Eleven days later the *Chronicle* made its only other reference to the incident with a one-sentence announcement of withdrawal of the 14th and 29th Regiments from the city to Castle William.[14]

Also on March 8, Richard Draper's pro-Tory *Boston News-Letter* printed a one-column neutral story of the Massacre. The *News-Letter* was the oldest newspaper in Boston, and for many years printed for the governor and his council. Draper set off the top of his story column with a row of large black dots. His lead consisted of a long sentence apologizing for not printing a fuller account, explaining that "A number of Gentlemen are collecting Evidences of the whole Transactions, as soon as these are done, an Account will be drawn up and Published in the Papers." Then followed a factual story of the incident without placing blame for the shooting. This excerpt shows Draper's attempt at fairness: "Soon after, the Word Fire! was heard, upon which one Gun went off, in a Second or two of Time one or two others. . . ." The account listed the dead and wounded. It ended with three short paragraphs describing the arrest of the soldiers and withdrawal of the troops as a result of town pressure on Hutchinson and his council applied in a series of meetings the following day.[15]

In its continued coverage of the Massacre, the News-Letter departed from the basically neutral position of its original account. It leaned, not to the Tory side, however, but to the Whig. On March 15th, Draper began his story by again explaining why he printed such a limited account the previous week, and rejecting more comprehensive coverage because ". . . there being many other Circumstances that have not been published, and additional Evidences daily arising. . . ." He thus appeared reluctant to be drawn into the mounting controversy. Nevertheless, he went on to print, again under a heading of black dots, a funeral account of those killed similar to that of the March 12th issue of the Boston Gazette--complete with coffin symbols, on which were inscribed initials of the dead.

In the same issue Draper offered evidence of support for Boston from around the colony. He printed a petition from the town of Roxbury backing Boston in its effort to rid the soldiers from its midst. Then followed an account of votes taken in a town meeting thanking Cambridge, Charlestown, Watertown, and "all our Brethren in the Towns through the Province, for the kind Concern

they manifested for us in the late horrid Massacre by the Soldiery. . . ."[16] News-Letter coverage continued for two more weeks with single-sentence announcements of troop withdrawals and the town's hiring of a schooner to take its side of the story to London.[17]

The News-Letter accounts, while not as numerous, detailed, or strident in tone as those in the Whig papers, offered readers a view of innocent people murdered by an aroused soldiery. The accounts made no attempt to excuse or defend them for their action. Despite its Tory reputation, the News-Letter favored a Whig view of the affair.

Historians generally agree that the Boston Gazette was the principal Whig newspaper in the American colonies. One of its printers, Benjamin Edes, was an original member of the Boston Loyall Nine, forerunners of the Sons of Liberty in that city. Sam Adams and his group of Whig leaders, including Josiah Quincy, Joseph Warren, James Otis, John Hancock, and Thomas Cushing, wrote extensively for it--Adams in particular. Material for the paper was often made up for the Monday publication over the weekend by Adams and his associates, assisting Edes and his partner, John Gill. The association between the Whig leaders and the Gazette was so strong that John Adams, in 1771, moved his office to "Queen-Street in the house of Mr. John Gill."[18]

It is not surprising, therefore, that the heaviest coverage of the Massacre and most clearly Whig point of they manifested for us in the late horrid Massacre by the soldiery. . . ."[16] Chronicle's coverage continued for ten more weeks with single-sentence announcements of troop withdrawals and the town's hiring of a schooner to take its side of the story to London.[17]

The News-Letter accounts, while not as numerous, detailed, or strident in tone as those in the Whig papers, offered readers a view of innocent people murdered by an aroused soldiery. The accounts made no attempt to excuse or defend them for their action. Despite its Tory reputation, the News-Letter favored a Whig view of the affair.

Historians generally agree that the Boston Gazette was the principal Whig newspaper in the American colonies. One of its printers, Benjamin Edes, was an original member of the Boston Loyall Nine, forerunners of the Sons of Liberty in that city. Sam Adams and his group of Whig leaders, including Josiah Quincy, Joseph Warren, James Otis, John Hancock, and Thomas Cushing, wrote extensively for it--Adams in particular. Material for the paper was often made up for the Monday publication over the weekend by Adams and his associates, assisting Edes and his partner, John Gill. The association between the Whig leaders and the Gazette was so strong that John Adams, in 1771, moved his office to "Queen-Street in the House of Mr. John Gill."[18]

It is not surprising, therefore, that the heaviest coverage of the Massacre and most clearly Whig point of view would appear in that paper. The original Gazette account filled nearly four full columns on two pages of its March 12th issue. All columns on both pages, even those with stories not pertaining to the affair, were heavily bordered in black. In the midst of that portion of the story telling of the funerals, the Gazette displayed its coffin symbols--thirteen lines high--with skull and crossbones and initials of the dead emblazoned on each. Samuel Maverick's coffin symbol also showed a scythe and hourglass--traditional symbols of death.

Either by itself or in combination with a similar account appearing the same day in the Boston Evening-Post (we examine it shortly), this Gazette article provided the source for a majority of Massacre news accounts which appeared throughout the colonies within the next month. This in itself is sufficient to mark its importance. But, beyond that, it is significant because it first presented three major themes about the Massacre, which Whig writers would repeat over and over again. These were:

1. The Massacre was a direct and inevitable result of quartering British soldiers among civilians--soldiers whose function, under a false guise of protection, was to threaten the populace into submission.

2. The soldiers were entirely at fault, killing innocents without provocation, and should be quickly punished.

3. The soldiers were conspiring with the customs commissioners in some sort of dark plot against liberty.

In a two-thirds column preamble to its description of the incident, the *Gazette* established the Whigs' fears about troop quartering. The opening sentence set the tone for what was to come:

> The Town of Boston affords a recent and melancholy Demonstration of the destructive Consequences of quartering Troops among citizens in a Time of Peace, under a Pretence of supporting the Laws and aiding Civil Authority. . . .

The account maximized hatred against the soldiers, accusing them of firing into a crowd consisting of "thirty or forty persons, mostly lads," under direct orders of Captain Preston, their officer-in-charge, for no other reason than they "were clamorous, and it is said, threw snow-balls." One paragraph, picked up three days later by the *News-Letter*, painted the results in these vivid terms:

> Tuesday Morning presented a most shocking Scene, the Blood of our Fellow Citizens running like Water thro' King-Street, and the Merchants Exchange the principal Spot of the Military Parade for about 18 Months past. Our Blood might also be track'd up to the Head of Long-Lane, and through divers other Streets and Passages.

Following a series of resolutions and votes demanding troop withdrawal, the Whig author drew his picture of conspiracy between the soldiers and the customs officials. He recounted the arrest of a boy who confessed to firing a gun out of the customs house under orders from his master, a man by the name of Manwaring, and several

others "hired by the Commissioners and Customs Officers to do their Business in." The account ended with one final reference to the dangers of standing armies, by equating the "dreadful Tragedy" to a recent, similar military action against a civilian population in St. Georges Field, London.[19]

Despite its Whig loyalties, the <u>Gazette</u> that day printed the first words heard from the other side. In a one-paragraph letter to Edes and Gill from the "Boston-Goal," Captain Preston thanked the inhabitants of the town for "throwing away Party and Prejudice . . . in Defence of my injured Innocence" with its treatment of him. We shall see how the Whigs later used this letter to their own advantage.[20]

That the Massacre evoked rapid response in neighboring communities was also reported by the <u>Gazette</u>. It told of "neighboring Towns actually under Arms upon the first report of the Massacre," with "many Thousands of our brave Brethren in the Country" only waiting a signal to march upon Boston. The paper also printed the petition from Roxbury to Hutchinson supporting Boston's demands for troop withdrawals--just one of several like it which appeared.[21]

A week later the <u>Gazette</u> again devoted the bulk of its two pages to Massacre stories. First appeared a letter addressed to "friends" of the town in London informing them

of the "present miserable Situation, occasioned by the Exorbitancy of the Military Power . . . long since stationed among us." The letter also dealt with the other basic themes contained in the original *Gazette* article by blaming the soldiers for firing without provocation and tying the affair to the customs officials. With the letter, and clipped from the *Essex Gazette* of March 13th, appeared an article by "A Whig" pledging armed support by 1,500 Salem men, if needed. The paper also reported Carr's death in a black-bordered announcement accompanied by a coffin symbol, attributing it to the "Rage of the Soldiery."

Edes and Gill also printed in this issue the first Tory counter to the Whig assertion that the soldiers provoked the affair. An article told of persons gathering "Testimonies," including one deposition accusing a boy in King Street of throwing a brickbat at the customs house. This article also reported the departure for England of customs officer John Robinson carrying depositions which would show the town guilty of provocation. These depositions would later form the basis for the Tory pamphlet, *A Fair Account . . .* , which we shall discuss in Chapter V.

Accompanying this story, however, was a contrasting one showing Whig activities of a similar nature. This article described other depositions being gathered, which of the "present miserable Situation, occasioned by the Obstinacy of the Military Power . . . long since stationed among us." The letter also dealt with the other Whig themes contained in the original *Gazette* article by blaming the soldiers for firing without provocation and tying the affair to the customs officials. With the letter, and clipped from the same *Gazette* of March 12th, appeared an article by "A Whig" pledging armed support by 1,500 Salem men, if needed. The paper also reported Carr's death in a black-bordered announcement accompanied by a coffin symbol, attributing it to the "Rage of the Soldiery."

Edes and Gill also printed in this issue the first Tory counter to the Whig assertion that the soldiers provoked the affair. An article told of persons gathering "testimonies," including one deposition accusing a boy in King Street of throwing a brickbat at the custom house. This article also reported the departure for England of customs officer John Robinson carrying depositions which would show the town guilty of provocations. These depositions would later form the basis for the Tory pamphlet, *A Fair Account. . .*, which we shall discuss in Chapter V.

Accompanying this story, however, was a contrasting one showing Whig activities of a similar nature. This article described other depositions being gathered, which would definitely brand the soldiers as the aggressors. Like the Tory depositions, the article indicated that these would also be sent to England. (They ultimately were, as the Whig pamphlet A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre . . . .) Each side was fighting to get its side of the story to London first.[22]

On March 26th the Gazette again devoted two pages (the third straight week) to the Massacre. A Whig writer responded to the previous week's Tory counter-argument by reiterating the size and composition of the crowd (thirty to forty boys), and complained of Robinson's departure with the Tory depositions, designed, he said, to deceive the "Administration into believing there was a threat to the customs house." The Gazette then debased Robinson's character with an accompanying article about a young man of dubious character from Boston who recently took a new job in New York. The story claimed he was previously Robinson's "Pimp and Procurer." In the same issue, Edes and Gill offered another Tory view of the affair, by printing a second deposition. In this one Angelo Michael Warwell provided an alibi for Manwaring and his servant boy by claiming they were somewhere else at the time of the shootings.[23]

Gazette coverage of the Massacre continued in diminishing amounts for another three weeks. Some stories were one or two-sentence accounts announcing the hiring and

sailing of Captain Gardner's schooner Betsey, carrying the town's story to London. Other longer articles complained of a delay in Manwaring's trial and failure to arrest others who had helped the soldiers.[24] On April 2nd, however, the Gazette presented, in its only page one account of the Massacre, another look at the standing army theme. In a reprint from the New Hampshire Gazette (mistakenly identified as the Portsmouth Gazette) of March 12th, "Consideration" appealed for vengeance, and hoped the Massacre served as an example that "Standing armies have ever proved themselves destructive to the Liberties of a people. . . ." In a tirade full of references to "Blood of innocent Americans," he likened the Massacre to "horrid scenes of barbarity and murder committed by the tyrants of Rome." This article diffused widely, as we shall see.[25]

The Boston Gazette went well beyond reporting the incident. Its coverage told a story of conspiracy between soldiers and customs commissioners, designed to subject the townspeople of Boston to the arbitrary will of outsiders. And if the people failed to submit, the Gazette showed them the result--they would be murdered. The few stories offering a Tory view were overwhelmed in number, size, and polemics by the Whig bias.

Thomas and John Fleet's Boston Evening-Post was the closest thing to a neutral newspaper printed in the city

during the Revolution. Schlesinger described it as "conscientiously and consistently" attempting to give equal coverage to both sides. And Yodelis' most recent study of Boston newspapers concludes that the Post did indeed pursue a course of printing both sides of the story. At the same time, however, both historians noted that, because of a greater amount of material provided by Whig writers, the paper publicized the Whig cause more than the Tory. Nothing illustrates this better than the Evening-Post's coverage of the Massacre.[26]

The Fleets were the only Boston printers to put an account of the Massacre on page one. Like the News-Letter they set off their story with a row of large black dots across the column. This was their only typographical emphasis--no coffins or black borders like the Gazette's. The Fleets concentrated on reporting the incident by printing a story remarkably similar to that of the Gazette. In fact, the accounts matched exactly in line after line.[27] It appears they obtained their account from the same Whig source as Edes and Gill. While leaving no doubt as to what happened and who was at fault, the Evening-Post article did not contain either the polemical preamble about the threat of standing armies or the succeeding story about Manwaring and the firing from the customs house, which had appeared in the Gazette. The account thus included the Massacre itself, casualty list, and interchanges between the town

and Crown officials. It thanked "with Gratitude, the generous Sympathy" of adjacent towns and the colony in general for their support. Then it ended with this poem, summarizing the writer's concern for the victims:

> With Fire enwrapt, farcharged with sudden Death,
> Lo, the pois'd Tube convolves it's fatal Breath!
> The flying Ball with heav'n directed Force, . . .
> How Caldwell, Attacks, Gray and Maverick fell.

While eschewing most references to a conspiracy, the Evening-Post did tell its readers that the Massacre had been planned. Earlier in the account, following this anguished cry over the incident:

> How the authors of the almost entire subversion of British Faith, British Liberty, Justice, Humanity and mutual Affection of all to all, can bear to read this tale, let others imagine!

the Post made its single reference to a preconceived plan against the town by the soldiers, saying:

> An apprehension of a settled plan for a general if not universal massacre, from such barbarous outrages in conjunction with their former attacks and continued menaces, justly alarmed the people: --The bells were set a ringing . . . .

This account, coupled with the March 5th story about the previous altercations between soldiers and ropewalkers, gave Evening-Post readers a Whig picture of the affair. The Fleets would do more.[28]

A week later the Post joined the Gazette in emphasizing all three major Massacre themes. On that day the Fleets printed Boston's letter to England. They also printed a letter from a country gentleman to "his Friend in

Boston" asking for information about the Massacre. In his reply the "Friend" explained in some detail that the incident resulted from the introduction of standing armies into the city by those who believed the "people a licentious, factious and rebellious rabble, which their lordships the common soldiery must awe into peace and good order. . . ." The Post also credited itself and the Gazette with the most "authentic" accounts of the Massacre "as could be collected."[29]

Over the next two weeks, the Post continued to emphasize the danger of troops living among civilians. On March 26 "A Whig" appeared, and in the April 2nd issue, the Fleets printed "Consideration." In each issue the Post also ran advertisements for a print, sold jointly by the Fleets and Edes and Gill, "containing a Representation of the late horrid Massacre in King-Street." The print depicted the Massacre scene, showing soldiers under command of an officer firing upon the citizens while the victims lay in the street, blood running from open wounds.[30]

Although they printed fewer articles than Edes and Gill, and minimized the customs service conspiracy theme, the Fleets, nevertheless, displayed strong Whig sentiment in their Massacre coverage. If Tory material, such as the Gazette offered, was available to them, they made no attempt to balance their Whig view by printing it. Evening-Post readers, therefore, got only slightly less

Whig persuasion than Gazette readers.

One other Massacre account appeared in Boston on March 12--in John Green and Joseph Russell's Post-Boy. The Post-Boy, although considered a Tory organ, was basically timid and non-controversial. It normally avoided politics, printing limited amounts of local news. It concentrated, instead, on articles from England.[31]

Despite its disinclination to get involved in local affairs, the Post-Boy covered the Massacre. Its account of the incident itself was identical to that which had appeared in the News-Letter four days earlier. Following that, Green and Russell added funeral details and the series of messages and resolutions running back and forth between the town and Hutchinson (much the same as the Gazette and Evening-Post of the same day). The paper did not press the story, however, breaking its coverage a week later with an account in which Boston thanked the towns of the colony for their support and "kind Concern they manifested for us in the late horrid Massacre by the Soldiers. . . ."[32]

Green and Russell's coverage was only partially in keeping with their reputation. Although they did not get deeply involved, what they did print presented a Whig view.

Outside Boston one other newspaper published in Massachusetts at the time of the Massacre. In Salem, Samuel Hall printed his Whig paper, The Essex Gazette.

every Tuesday. Hall began his paper in 1768, printing it by himself until 1772 when he took in his brother, Ebenezer, as a partner. The paper changed its name to *The New England Chronicle* when it moved to Cambridge in the spring of 1775.[33]

In its Massacre coverage the *Salem Gazette* clipped its stories almost exclusively from the *Boston Gazette*. On March 13, Hall gave his readers the *Boston Gazette*'s entire account of the affair in two black-bordered pages. Salem responded, as we have seen, by readying its men to rush to Boston's defense. "A Whig" also requested supporting resolutions from throughout "America," and further asked that citizens prepare to "sacrifice their Lives in extirpating a profligate, licentious and blood-thirsty Soldiery. . . ."[34]

Over the next four weeks, the *Gazette* treated its readers to additional examples of its Boston namesake's vituperative persuasion including Carr's death, "Consideration's" fear of standing armies, plus denunciation of bail for Manwaring and the others accused of firing from the customs house. This last article pushed for a speedy trial, claiming the issue was being delayed. If innocent, it said, they should be released, if guilty, they should be "hanged."[35]

In order to assist the reader in picturing the disparity between the amounts of Whig and Tory material

appearing in the newspapers, Table 1 has been prepared. From it can be seen that the Massachusetts newspapers printed over four times as many articles favoring a Whig view of the incident as a Tory and neutral one. Through the preceding analysis of these articles, we have seen that the Whig accounts were also much longer and partisan, thus intending to be more persuasive. There is little doubt that Massachusetts got and responded to Whig news of the "horrid Massacre."

TABLE 1

DIFFUSION OF NEWS STORIES RESULTING FROM BOSTON MASSACRE: POLITICAL BIAS BY COLONY[*]

Bias	Mass.	Conn.	N.Y.	Pa.	Va.	S.C.
Tory	6	1	2	2	1	1
Whig	34	19	5	22	4	7
Neutral	2		3	2	1	1

[*] This table shows number of stories one paragraph or greater in length which appeared in all newspapers up until coverage break in news deriving from the incident itself.

Connecticut

Three newspapers were printed in Connecticut at the time of the Boston Massacre, one in each of the major population centers. They all were Whig, and published by members of the largest family of printers in the colonies--the Greens. Thomas Green, in partnership with Ebenezer Watson, produced the Connecticut Courant in Hartford until

1771 when Watson took it alone. Thomas and Samuel Green printed their Connecticut Journal in New Haven; while Timothy Green's New-London Gazette appeared in that town. Each paper printed throughout the period covered by this study, with Timothy Green changing the name of his to the Connecticut Gazette in December, 1773.[36]

The first mention of the Massacre in Connecticut appeared in the Connecticut Courant on Monday, March 12. Green and Watson received the information three days earlier "By an Express from Boston to New York, who went through this town on Friday last. . . ." Their account stated that a "Number of Inhabitants" had been killed "Opposite the Custom-House in King-street Boston" by fire from weapons of a "small Detachment of Soldiers," directed by a "Captain of the Regulars." We shall later see this rider arrive in New York, where his news was handled somewhat differently. In the same issue appeared an account, taken from the Boston Evening-Post, detailing the previous altercations between British soldiers and the ropewalkers. The Courant explained that "a more Particular Account of this tragical Affair must wait the Arrival of the Thursday's Post from Boston. . . ."[37]

When the regular post rider got to Hartford he must have brought Green and Watson copies of both the Boston Gazette and Evening-Post of March 12, because on March 19 the Courant combined those papers' original Massacre

articles into a single account. Without special typography the Courant gave its readers the Boston Gazette view that the "horrid Massacre" resulted from an unprovoked attack upon innocent townspeople by British soldiers acting in combination with customs officials in a plot to tyrannize them. As an extra, Green and Watson added the Evening-Post's poem, but excluded Preston's jail letter. This was the first of three newspapers in the colonies to combine Massacre stories from the Boston papers.[38]

The customs menace was not lost on at least one Courant reader. In the same issue, under a March 13 Hartford dateline, an anonymous local writer set forth his "Dream." In it he envisioned the customs commissioners seized by Boston citizens and shipped to England in chains. The dreamer awaited the next post "For the Solution" to his vision.[39]

Green and Watson continued their coverage for three weeks in April after skipping the week of March 26. On April 2 the Courant used the Boston News-Letter as a source to tell about the Whig effort to get its side of the story to England before the Tories; reprinted "Consideration" out of the Evening-Post; and from the Boston Gazette, complained of bail for Manwaring and the others accused of firing from the customs house. Thus, Hartford readers got a Whig view of how and why the Massacre occurred, even though Green and Watson took their stories from a variety of sources.[40]

New Haven citizens read about the Massacre on March 16, when the Connecticut Journal reproduced the entire Boston Gazette account, including Preston's letter from the Boston jail. In the same issue the Journal, like the Courant, printed the Evening-Post article telling of earlier troubles with the soldiers.[41] After attesting, on March 23, to the credibility of their account (by quoting the Evening-Post's opinion of the Gazette's coverage), the Greens reported on March 30--again from the Boston Gazette--that Boston had hired a ship "to carry to England a full Representation of the Tragical Affair. . . ."

For the remainder of its coverage (lasting through April 20) the Journal continued to print stories out of the Boston Gazette stressing conspiracy between the soldiers and the customs officials. In an article on April 6, the Journal explained that only boys had been on the street in front of the customs house, and any "ill-language that might have passed" was caused by the sentry's harassment of them. This story also accused the customs commissioners of lying in their attempts to show a threat against the customs house. On April 20, the Journal told that a member of the Boston grand jury was upset because two persons guilty of helping the commissioners in the shooting had not been arrested.[42]

In New London, Timothy Green told his readers on March 16 the Massacre was an unprovoked attack upon the

citizens of Boston as a direct consequence of stationing an army among them as a means of subjection. In reproducing the Boston Gazette account, Green eliminated that portion tying the customs officials to the act. He would bring out this aspect of the affair later. The New-London Gazette embellished its account with four black coffin symbols deleting, however, the initials originally placed upon them by the Boston source.[43]

After reporting Carr's death in its next issue, the Gazette implicated the customs officials in the affair on March 30. That day the paper reprinted the Boston Gazette story which claimed they were falsely trying to prove design upon the customs house with their deposition-gathering and sending of that story to England. Green accompanied this article with the account connecting Robinson with the pimp. A week later Green told his readers that four minor officials had been arrested for firing from the customs house. He got this latter story from the Newport (R.I.) Mercury of April 2, which had obtained it from a man who had arrived "in Town from Boston." In this same issue the Gazette returned to the standing army theme by printing "Consideration" from the Boston Evening-Post.[44]

By April 6 New London was responding to the news of the Massacre and its threat to liberty by soldiers. Along with "Consideration" Green printed a locally written

article "By a Friend to his Country," citing the "innocent Blood . . . lately spilt in the Streets of Boston . . . by the infernal Outrage and blood thirsty Measures of some of the Soldiery . . . ." *Gazette* coverage broke on April 20 with the "Grand Jury-Man" article.[45]

New London, Hartford, and New Haven received the Whig side of the story, with one exception. Table 1 shows that Connecticut got a relatively larger dose than Massachusetts with only one short article out of eighteen giving an opposing view. Connecticut also responded to the news, as shown by Hartford and New London writers. The eastern part of the colony would have displayed greater reaction in the *New-London Gazette* than it did if Green had had more room to print "numerous Addresses from the Country Towns relative to the Non-Importation Agreement and the late Massacre. . . ."[46]

New York

Political leanings of newspapers in New York reflected diversified sentiments in that colony. Two, John Holt's *New York Journal* and the *Post-Boy* of James Parker possessed a strong Whig reputation. Hugh Gaine's *New York Mercury* seemed to ride with the political tide, shifting from one side to the other as either party rose to power. On balance, however, it favored the Tories more than the Whigs. Holt, called the "Liberty printer" by John Adams, published throughout the period, as did Gaine. Parker died

in June, 1770, and the Post-Boy was taken over by Samuel Inslee and Anthony Car. Under these partners it survived only until August, 1773.[47]

John Holt printed his original account on March 15 from information he received from "an Express" who left Boston on Wednesday, March 7, arriving in New York on Monday, March 12. This was probably the same rider who came through Hartford on Friday, March 9, providing the source for the Connecticut Courant's original account. No other Connecticut papers mentioned expresses, and the most direct route between Boston and New York is through central Connecticut. Time is also about right. The rider reached Hartford--about half-way to New York--in two days, taking something over four days for the entire trip. Additional messengers arrived in New York on the next two days.

If the Boston Whigs hoped for a repeat of the "Journal of Occurrences" by feeding information to New York, Holt's first story failed to provide it. In a low-key factual account, he tried to dissuade his readers from faulting the soldiers for the incident, saying the rider "could not certainly tell the Reason,--whether they were assaulted, or too closely pressed, or were order'd to fire. . . ." Holt's article, probably locally written, appeared in italics (a mark of a printer-written story). It began by summarizing previous difficulties between Boston and the soldiers, then presented facts about the

incident. It ended with Hutchinson's decision to remove the troops. Holt questioned the validity of his information or attributed it to the "Express" four times throughout his story. He further detailed his policy of neutrality in a note following the article.[48]

Holt's continued coverage did not match his reputation as a devoted Whig, either. Although he printed articles about the Massacre for a month, he limited the number to one or two per issue, following a basically neutral course by balancing those of Whig flavor with Tory views.

The *Journal* did not directly mention the incident again for two weeks, although Holt did print, on March 22, a combination of *Boston Gazette* and *Evening-Post* accounts of the Snider murder. However, he never tied that affair to the Massacre. On March 29 the paper blamed the incident on the soldiers, but not through the medium of a Boston newspaper. Instead Holt printed, under a Philadelphia dateline, an "Extract of a letter from a Gentleman in Boston to his friend in this City," which he clipped from the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* of March 19. This letter faulted the soldiers for firing without provocation, but made no effort to convince the Philadelphian that a plot existed.[49]

A week later the *Journal* fired its heaviest Whig shot by printing, from the *Boston Gazette*, the letter of

the town to England which summarized Whig feelings about the conspiracy behind the Massacre. On April 12, however, the paper gave a Tory side. In that issue Holt produced an extract of a letter from Boston in answer to a request from a New York writer for information about the incident. The letter tried to "show that the People of this Town, have not on all Occasions, been so innocent and free from Aggression, as they represent themselves." It went on to tell of an "Outrageous Mob" harassing a sentry, who was defended by the soldiers. The letter characterized the shooting as the result of threats against the soldiers who feared for their lives. It further summarized the previous disturbances between soldiers and townspeople as caused by "The lower Sort of People, whose Minds were poisoned to that End, instead of looking on the Soldiery as fellow Subjects and Countrymen." Thus did the "Liberty printer" balance his books. Holt broke his coverage a week later.[50]

The other Whig paper in New York acted much the same way. Although only two issues of the Post-Boy were available, they reveal similar neutral coverage of the Massacre. James Parker's first story appeared on March 19. It came from Draper's Boston News-Letter. Thus Parker opted for neutrality, when a Whig view of the affair was available to him, if only through the information brought by the messengers from Boston. By April 2, Parker's coverage was down to one paragraph. From the Boston

Gazette, he printed the account of the town's hiring of Captain Gardner's schooner to take its side of the story to London. Although it is possible that missing issues of the Post-Boy contained more extensive coverage, it seems unlikely considering what Parker printed in those issues examined.[51]

On the same day that Parker printed his first account, Hugh Gaine also went to the Boston News-Letter for his story of the Massacre. At the same time he gave his readers background for the incident by using the Boston Evening-Post article concerning previous difficulties between the ropewalkers and soldiers. By implication, then, the Mercury blamed the soldiers. The following week Gaine added little to his coverage as he again picked the News-Letter as a source. On March 26, he reprinted the messages passing between Hutchinson and the town which resulted in troop withdrawals. To this he added Preston's letter from the Boston jail--from the Boston Gazette.[52]

A week later the Mercury became more Whiggish. By printing (from the Boston Evening-Post) Boston's letter to London, Gaine introduced his readers to the idea of a conspiracy and the threat of a standing army to liberty. In an accompanying reprint from the Post of an "Extract of a letter from Boston," the Mercury emphasized the Whig position that Boston Tories needed the army to awe the people into submission. Gaine ended his coverage of the

incident on April 16 with a one-sentence announcement that Manwaring had been indicted for murder. He had presented a stronger Whig view of the Massacre than either of the "Whig" newspapers.[53]

New York newspaper coverage is puzzling. Table 1 shows that the three papers gave basically balanced coverage, and relatively little at that. Clearly, the printers ignored the bulk of the Whig polemics. In view of New York's long association with British troops (General Gage's headquarters was located there), and the recent Golden Hill altercation between New Yorkers and the soldiers, the question is why did the Whig papers downplay the Massacre? This study can not provide the answer, but Schlesinger has suggested that both Parker and Holt were under extreme pressure from British officials because of their past activities, particularly in supporting Alexander McDougall in writing against additional financing of British troops stationed in New York.[54]

Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, the largest city in the colonies at the time of the Massacre, with a population of about 29,000, possessed five newspapers. Two printed in German, and are not included in this study. (See Appendix A.) The remaining three favored the Whigs, but to varying degrees. The strongest Whig paper was William and Thomas Bradford's Pennsylvania Journal. Like John Holt, William

Bradford had the reputation of a "Patriot printer." He was secretary of the Philadelphia Sons of Liberty. The Pennsylvania Chronicle matched the wandering, argumentive character of its printer, William Goddard. Substantially Whig, the Chronicle only lacked the Journal's consistency. When Goddard was involved in his personal arguments with individuals on both sides of the political spectrum, the Chronicle focused on things other than the political situation. The Pennsylvania Gazette was Benjamin Franklin's old paper. Printed now by David Hall and William Sellers it supported the Whigs, though lacking the dedication of the Journal.[55]

The Chronicle published the first news of the Massacre in Philadelphia on March 19. Under a March 15 New York dateline, Goddard reprinted the New York Journal account of the incident, less the final paragraph which told about the arrival of additional expresses in New York. This was probably the only account available to him at the time. Only a week had passed since the Gazette and Evening-Post articles had appeared in Boston--hardly sufficient time for them to travel the distance to Philadelphia by postal service. But Goddard must have had the Boston papers of February 26, because he printed a combination of Gazette and Evening-Post articles about Snider's murder, which had not previously appeared in any newspaper.[56]

Between this first account and his break in coverage Goddard made up for his modest beginning by giving his readers the same Whig story of conspiracy that Boston had received. On March 26 the *Chronicle* reprinted the March 5 *Evening-Post* account of troubles between the soldiers and ropewalkers. Following this came a combination of *Gazette* and *Evening-Post* original articles about the Massacre, including the introduction warning of the dangers of standing armies and the part tying the customs commissioners to the affair through their firing from the customs house. To this Goddard added the *Post*'s poem. Although the format of the *Chronicle*'s account was similar to that of the *Connecticut Courant*, the section implicating the customs officials contained information not included in the Connecticut paper's article. In fact, Goddard reprinted that portion of the story exactly as it had originally appeared in the *Boston Gazette*. Thus, he must have combined the two Boston accounts from their original versions.[57]

Over the next five weeks, Goddard reprinted extensively the *Boston Gazette* view of the affair. He gave his *Chronicle* readers "A Whig," "Consideration," Boston's reply to Preston's jail letter, and actions of the Boston committee in taking "legal" testimonies proving the soldiers "aggressors." On April 16 he showed what another Massachusetts town thought of the conspiracy between Crown

elements. The "Votes of the town of Abington" included the opinion:

> That the troops (may they not more properly be called murderers) sent to Boston . . . at the request of Governor Bernard to aid and protect the Commissioners of the Customs . . . amount to an open declaration of war . . . we are reduced to a state of nature, whereby our natural right of opposing force is again devolved upon us.[58]

Three days after the Chronicle first reported the Massacre, the Pennsylvania Journal began its five-week coverage of the affair by also printing a combination of Boston Gazette and Evening-Post articles. This account included portions of the original Post story, which had not appeared previously. Thus the Bradfords, as Goddard was to do four days later, combined their story from the original versions.[59]

Also like the Chronicle, the Journal printed most of the strongly Whig articles from the Boston press. By the time Journal coverage broke, its readers knew the implications of the event through exposure to Whig themes. Journal readers got Boston's letter to London on April 5, along with the town's version of deposition-gathering and its complaints regarding Robinson's departure for England with "false information." On April 12 they learned of the arrest and indictment of four customs officials for firing from the customs house (this was the Newport, R. I., article which appeared earlier in the New-London Gazette) and read "A Whig's" opinion of the threat of standing

armies. Finally, on April 26, the *Journal* reported Boston's complaints about bail and delay of trial for those officials.[60]

By selective editing of their clippings, Hall and Sellers emphasized implication of the customs commissioners in the Massacre. Their *Pennsylvania Gazette* did not completely delete references to the danger of standing armies, but it subordinated this theme. *Gazette* coverage began on March 22 (the same day as the *Journal*'s) with two Massacre stories. Under a New York dateline came the *New York Journal* account of the incident. It was followed, under "BOSTON, March 12," by the *Boston Gazette* story without that paper's introduction about the threat of soldiers to civilians. This was the only paper to this point using the original *Gazette* article, which deleted the introduction.[61]

A week later, however, the *Gazette* addressed the earlier-ignored subject by reprinting "A Whig" under the original "SALEM, March 13" dateline. In that same issue Hall and Sellers told of troop removals and Carr's death by reprinting two *Boston News-Letter* articles of March 15. Over the next three weeks the *Gazette* printed only three more Massacre stories, but each stressed the link between the customs officials and the killings. Of the three Pennsylvania newspapers, the *Gazette* provided the smallest Massacre coverage, and the least polemical in terms of a

double conspiracy.[62]

As graphically depicted by Table 1, the Pennsylvania press provided its readers the fullest Massacre coverage outside Massachusetts. Each newspaper played the story about the way one might expect from its individual reputation. With the possible exception of the Gazette, the Pennsylvania press exposed its readers to the full spectrum of Massacre themes and coverage offered by the Boston Whigs.

Virginia

Virginia's newspaper situation was unique in America in that both newspapers printed in the colony during 1770 bore the same name--The Virginia Gazette. Only by reference to the printer could they be separated. The Gazette of Alexander Purdie and John Dixon was older, having printed in Williamsburg since 1751. In 1766 Thomas Jefferson and some associates, concerned with limitations imposed upon free expression by this situation, brought William Rind to the capital to begin a second Virginia Gazette. So little has been written about these papers it is difficult and dangerous to attach a political label to each. At most, historians have considered them moderately Whig, with Rind slightly more so.[63]

Located at the southern end of the overland postal system, Williamsburg did not receive information about the Massacre until nearly a month after it happened. When it

did, the newspapers gave spare coverage to the incident. Rind printed the first news about the event on March 29 under a local dateline. His account read:

> It is reported that a fray happened lately at Boston, between some of the Inhabitants and some of the soldiers, and that the latter fired upon, and killed several of the former; whereupon a large number of the inhabitants rose, and (the report says) drove the soldiers out of the town, and the Commissioners vanished nobody knew where. We hope there is no truth in this report, but if there is, a few days will clear it up.[64]

A week later both printers had received northern newspapers, and offered their readers substantially the same picture of the Massacre--that of the Boston Gazette. The story Virginia readers got, while limited, showed the "dangerous consequences" of standing armies as it blamed the soldiers for shooting down innocent civilians without reason. Both papers deleted that portion of the story telling of firing from the customs house. No other papers played the story in this manner. Thus, in their first stories, the only reference each Gazette made to involvement of the customs officials in the affair was to say, ". . . To the Commissioners . . . are we indebted as the procuring cause of the military power in this capital." This single clause appeared in the introduction.

Rind chose to emphasize the soldiers' militancy by accompanying his account with an article about the previous difficulties between troops and ropewalkers. This he got from the Boston News-Letter of March 8. By contrast,

Purdie and Dixon tied the incident more closely to the customs officials. Along with their Massacre story they printed the Boston Evening-Post account of Snider's murder. Two weeks later they came back to the standing army threat with "A Whig." This April 19 article ended Massacre coverage in the two Virginia Gazettes. Table 1 shows that Virginia coverage, though limited, favored a Whig view of the Massacre.[65]

South Carolina

South Carolina possessed three newspapers during the period. All published in Charleston (called Charles-Town then), the fourth largest city in the colonies. The South Carolina Gazette of Peter Timothy was the strongest Whig paper in the South. Timothy, like Benjamin Edes in Boston and William Bradford in Philadelphia, participated actively in Whig affairs. He served as secretary to the South Carolina assembly during the early 1770's. Charles Crouch founded his South Carolina Country Journal as an organ of dissent against the Stamp Act. It continued to support the Whigs throughout the Revolution. The South Carolina and American General Gazette of Robert Wells favored the Tories.[66]

With overland travel to South Carolina hampered by lack of roads through the swamps below Virginia, no postal rider serviced the colony. News from the north came

irregularly by ship. As a result Timothy and Wells geared their publishing to arrival of ships. Although each had a normal printing day (Timothy on Monday, Wells on Friday), as often as not each did not publish then. The two papers, therefore, appeared as "Supplements," "Postscripts," and "Additions" on various days of the week. Crouch usually stuck to a regular day--Tuesday. When ship arrivals were sparse, all three papers appeared with pages full of advertising.[67]

Wells was innovative in his presentation of American news. He habitually clipped and pasted verbatim major addresses, letters, resolutions, and proceedings, but summarized daily happenings. He rewrote much material, often placing events from other colonies under a "Charlestown" dateline.

On April 4, 1770, Captain Jesse Hunt's sloop Hope arrived in Charleston harbor out of New York--the first ship from the north in a week. It brought several northern newspapers, thereby providing the first news of the Massacre to South Carolina. Timothy responded the next day with one of the strongest displays of Massacre coverage outside Massachusetts. The South Carolina Gazette devoted pages one and two to the incident, bordering its columns in heavy black lines under a blackened colophon. Timothy reprinted the entire Boston Gazette account of the affair, adding the Evening-Post poem at the end. Along with the

story he printed a combination of Gazette and Evening-Post accounts of the earlier disturbances involving the soldiers and townspeople. A staunch Whig printer thus laid the full Whig story of conspiracy before his readers in a single package. But, with exception of a one-sentence announcement on May 17 of Ebenezer Richardson's trial for Snider's murder, Timothy dropped the story with his initial effort.[68]

On the following day, April 6, Robert Wells summarized, in two short paragraphs, the previous disturbances and the incident itself, plus Robinson's and the troops' departure from the town. He twice credited New York as his source, saying, "Advices from New York inform us . . ." and later, "they write from New York."[69]

Crouch came out with a "Supplement" to his Country Journal on Saturday, April 7, to tell the Massacre story as strongly as Timothy. The Journal's columns were black-bordered on pages one and two, and Crouch displayed the coffin symbols--complete with embellishments--as they had appeared in the Boston Gazette original. His account was similar to Timothy's, but he added Preston's letter from the Boston jail and a report from the Boston News-Letter of March 15 telling of Carr's death. Unlike Timothy, however, Crouch printed only one paragraph of the Snider affair as an introduction to his Massacre story.[70]

Crouch continued his coverage a little longer than

Timothy. On May 8, he reprinted--under a Boston dateline--that town's letter of conspiracy to England. Little information was coming from the north at this time. According to ship lists, only two vessels had arrived in Charleston during the two-week period prior to the appearance of this article. They both docked on April 30--one from Philadelphia, the other from New York. This probably accounts for the spotty and limited coverage by both Whig printers. Crouch also printed the results of Richardson's trial on May 17. Nearly two months later, on July 3, he added the Boston Gazette version of "Consideration's" bloody warning of the threat of standing armies.[71]

Charleston's newspapers lived up to their reputations, printing about as much material as was available to them. And South Carolina readers received a stronger Whig view of the Massacre than the quantities shown in Table 1 reflect. No other city got the graphical display from two newspapers that the South Carolina Gazette and the Country Journal provided--not even Boston.

Summary

The amount of coverage newspapers gave to the Boston Massacre varied considerably among the colonies. As might be expected, the Massachusetts press paid most attention to the incident, as three newspapers followed the affair for a month or more. Although the total number of articles appearing in Pennsylvania and Connecticut was less

Timothy. On May 4, he reprinted--under a Boston dateline--that town's letter of conspiracy to England. Little information was coming from the north at this time. According to ship lists, only two vessels had arrived in Charleston during the two-week period prior to the appearance of this article. They both docked on April 30--one from Philadelphia, the other from New York. This probably accounts for the spotty and limited coverage by both whig printers. Crouch also printed the results of Richardson's trial on May 17. Nearly two months later, on July 5, he added the *Boston Gazette* version of "Considerations'" bloody warning of the threat of standing armies.[73]

Charleston's newspapers lived up to their expectations, printing about as much material as was available to them. And South Carolina readers received a stronger whig view of the Massacre than the quantities shown in Table 1 reflect. No other city got the graphic display that two newspapers like the *South Carolina Gazette* and the *Country Journal* provided--not even Boston.

Summary

The amount of coverage newspapers gave to the Boston Massacre varied considerably among the colonies. As might be expected, the Massachusetts press paid most attention to the incident, as three newspapers followed the affair for a month or more. Although the total number of articles appearing in Pennsylvania and Connecticut was less than in Massachusetts, newspapers in both colonies reported the event for five weeks. New York, where heavy coverage might also have been expected, fell far below its neighbors. Newspapers in the South provided less coverage of the Massacre than those of any other section. The Virginia press printed about the same amount as New York, while South Carolina provided only slightly more.

A Whig view of the Massacre dominated in all colonies except New York, where overall coverage came close to being neutral. Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania got full exposure to three basic themes propounded by Whig writers: the Massacre was the direct result of Britain's unlawful act in stationing an army among civilians in time of peace; fault for the incident lay completely with the soldiers who had preplanned a slaughter of the townspeople; and the affair grew out of a sinister conspiracy between customs officials and the army to force Boston's submission to illegal laws. Of these three themes, the last drew least attention in the press.

For the most part New York newspapers avoided taking sides. Although their accounts did blame the soldiers for the killings, they made no reference to a premeditated plot for murder and minimized the idea of a dark conspiracy against liberty. By contrast, in the small number of articles they printed, newspapers in Virginia and South Carolina emphasized the inherent dangers of a standing

army and exposed the Whig concept of a preconceived plan to murder innocent civilians. While the number of articles newspapers in each of the southern colonies printed was not significantly greater than that of New York's, the tone was considerably more polemical.

Except for a few articles, accounts of the Massacre appearing outside Massachusetts derived from stories printed in the Bay Colony's newspapers. However, only in the case of the major articles appearing in the week after the killings was it shown that printers in other colonies clipped directly from the Massachusetts source. Not only did the Boston Gazette lead the way in publicizing the event in Massachusetts, but it provided a majority of stories printed in other colonies. While it presented the strongest Whig view of the incident, it also printed the bulk of the limited Tory response which claimed the soldiers' actions were self-defensive. Thus, most of the small number of Tory articles that diffused also came from the Gazette. For those newspapers that offered neutral views, the News-Letter usually provided the source.

Several newspapers did not report the Massacre in a manner consistent with their established political reputations. In Massachusetts, the pro-Tory News-Letter printed mostly Whig-biased material. And, while historians claim neutrality for the Evening-Post, that paper printed Whig accounts exclusively. Among New York newspapers, the

pro-Whig Journal and Post-Boy not only paid scant attention to the Massacre, but eschewed most of the Whig argument about the affair. This, despite Boston Whig efforts to get the news to New York as quickly as possible by special messenger. As the Whig papers were minimizing the Massacre, the pro-Tory New York Mercury provided the strongest Whig view to appear in that colony.

At least three colonies initially received word about the Massacre from interpersonal sources. Hartford, Connecticut, and New York City got it from the same "express" in four and seven days, respectively, from the time of the killings. Virginia heard about it from an unidentified source in twenty-four days. Other than these initial reports and an occasional letter, all news came from newspapers delivered by the postal service. From time of publication in a Massachusetts paper, news took from four to six days to get to Connecticut (depending upon the city), ten days to New York, fourteen days to reach Philadelphia, and a month to Virginia. Sea service to Charleston, South Carolina, was irregular. Some articles appeared there in about a month, while at least one required two months for publication. These times compare favorably with those contained in Andrew's study of news diffusion.[72]

Newspapers also showed reaction to news of the Massacre. Towns all over Massachusetts erupted in pro-Whig Journal and Gazette not only paid scant attention to the Massacre, but excluded most of the Whig arguments about the affair. Thus, despite Boston Whig efforts to get the news to New York as quickly as possible by special messenger, as the Whig papers were minimizing the Massacre, the pro-Tory New York Mercury provided the strongest Whig view to appear in that colony.

At least three colonies initially received word about the Massacre from intercolonial sources. Hartford, Connecticut, and New York City got it from the news "express" in four and seven days, respectively, from the time of the killings. Virginia heard about it from an unidentified source in twenty-four days. Other than these initial reports and an occasional letter, all news came from newspapers delivered by the postal service. From time of publication in a Massachusetts paper, news took from four to six days to get to Connecticut (depending upon the city), ten days to New York, fourteen days to reach Philadelphia, and a month to Virginia. News arriving to Charleston, South Carolina, was irregular. Some articles appeared there in about a month, while at least one required two months for publication. These times compare favorably with those determined in Andrews's study of news diffusion.[13]

Newspapers also showed restraint in news of the Massacre. Towns all over Massachusetts engaged in indignation and pledged support to Boston in that city's efforts to rid itself of the soldiers. Connecticut citizens were also aroused to comment on the affair. Beyond an occasional letter of inquiry from New York and Pennsylvania, however, the New England colonies were the only ones in which public recognition of the incident appeared in the press.

By the time the South Carolina Country Journal printed the final article in its initial coverage of the Massacre, Boston newspapers had begun printing a second phase of the overall story. The next chapter focuses on the trials for murder of Captain Preston, the soldiers, and the four men accused of firing from the customs house. These trials came about in late 1770, but were preceded in the press by several other significant accounts referring to the Massacre. We begin with these.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1] Jensen, *Founding*, pp. 225-28. Numerous works exist which tell this story. Among older books, Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931) remains an excellent overview. Among newer works, G. B. Warden, *Boston 1689-1776* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970) is particularly applicable to circumstances in Boston, while the first five chapters of Zobel, *Massacre*, best show how the local situation affected the event. Jensen is most often cited here, because his is the newest and best general study of the period.

[2] Jensen, *ibid.*, pp. 242-43, 283-87.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 281-82.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 288-91, 334-35; James T. Adams, *Revolutionary New England, 1691-1776* (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923), pp. 374-75; John Shy, *Toward Lexington* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 97, 112, 238; Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, pp. 112-15.

[5] Jensen, *Founding*, p. 292; John C. Miller, *Sam Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 168-69; Adams, *New England*, p. 374.

[6] Warden, *Boston*, p. 210; Jensen, *Founding*, p. 245; Yodelis, "Paper War," p. 442; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 312. Yodelis and Schlesinger credit cooper's identification to Harbottle Dorr, a Whig sympathizer and Boston shopkeeper who collected and annotated copies of the *Boston Gazette* and *Evening-Post* throughout the period. Arthur M. Schlesinger, "Propaganda and the Boston Newspaper Press, 1767-1770," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications*, XXXII (1937), 407-10.

[7] BNL, Feb. 22, 1770, p. 3, Mar. 1, p. 3; BG, Feb. 26, 1770, p. 3, of Supplement; BEP, Feb. 26, 1770, p. 3.

[8] BG, *ibid*; BEP, *ibid*; Zobel, *Massacre*, pp. 164-79, gives a full account of the incident.

[9] BG, Mar. 5, 1770, p. 2; BEP, Mar. 5, 1770, p. 3.

[10] BG, *ibid.*, p. 3; BNL, Mar. 8, 1770, p. 1, of Postscript; Zobel, *Massacre*, pp. 180-84.

[11] Lyman H. Butterfield (ed.), *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, Vol. III (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 292.

[12] Shipton, *Thomas*, p. 17; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 104; Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 458-69.

[13] BC, Mar. 8, 1770, p. 3.

[14] BC, Mar. 19, 1770, p. 3; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 104-08; John Alden, "John Mein; Scourge of Patriots," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications*, XXXIV (1937-1942), 571-99, is a short biography of Mein, and accounts for his joining the Tory lists.

[15] Isaiah Thomas, *The History of Printing in America*, Vol. II (2d ed.; Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell, 1874), p. 58; Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 59-79; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 94; BNL, Mar. 8, 1770, p. 1, of Postscript; Andrew, "News Dissemination," p. 112, erroneously identified the earliest Massacre accounts in the Boston papers as appearing on March 12. The *News-Letter* and *Chronicle* accounts of March 8 were first.

[16] BNL, Mar. 15, 1770, pp. 3, 5.

[17] BNL, Mar. 22, 1770, p. 3, Mar. 29, p. 3.

[18] Davidson, *Propaganda*, pp. 227-28; Schlesinger, "Stamp Act," p. 73; Emery, *Press*, p. 100; Warden, *Boston*, p. 210; Butterfield (ed.), *Adams Diary*, I, p. 343; Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 446-47; BEP, Apr. 29, 1771, p. 4.

[19] BG, Mar. 12, 1770, pp. 2-3; Jensen, *Founding*, p. 318. St. Georges Field Massacre occurred when Scottish soldiers fired into a mob of rioters outside King's Bench Prison, London, killing five or six persons. The mob was demanding release of John Wilkes who was closely identified with American Whigs. For an account of this relationship see Pauline Maier, "John Wilkes and American Disillusionment with Great Britain," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., XX (July, 1963), 373-95.

[20] BG, Mar.12, 1770, p. 3.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] BG, Mar. 19, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[23] BG, Mar. 26, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[24] BG, Apr. 9, 1770, p. 3, Apr. 16, p. 2.

[25] BG, Apr. 2, 1770, p. 1.

[26] Davidson, Propaganda, p. 228; Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 285; Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 100-13, is a thorough measurement combining content analysis with printers and subscribers statements.

[27] Andrew, "News Dissemination," pp. 112-13, mistakenly says the Gazette and Evening-Post articles matched "word for word." Though close, they are not exact, and each contains paragraphs not in the other.

[28] BEP, Mar. 12, 1770, pp. 1-2, Mar. 5, p. 3.

[29] BEP, Mar. 19, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[30] BEP, Mar. 26, 1770, p. 4, Apr. 2, pp. 2, 4. Two engravings of the Massacre scene were done in America and shipped to England where they were combined into one as a cover for the Whig pamphlet A Short Narrative . . . . Paul Revere's is the better known of the two, but Henry Pelham's was entitled "Fruits of Arbitrary Power." Thus it is probably the one to which this advertisement referred. The Fleets and Edes and Gill sold Revere's also. For a full account of the Massacre prints, see Clarence S. Brigham, Paul Revere's Engravings (New York: Atheneum, 1969), pp. 52-73.

[31] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 133; Yodelis, "Paper War," p. 347.

[32] BPB, Mar. 12, 1770, p. 3, Mar. 19, p. 2.

[33] Davidson, Propaganda, p. 229; Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 95; Thomas, Printing, I, p. 177, II, p. 74; Brigham, Bibliography, I, 394, 353.

[34] EG, Mar. 13, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[35] EG, Mar. 20, 1770, p. 1, Mar. 27, p. 3, Apr. 3, p. 2, Apr. 10, p. 3.

[36] Davidson, Propaganda, p. 229; Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 57, 109; Thomas, Printing, I, pp. 184-91, II, pp. 85-91; Brigham, Bibliography, I, pp. 22, 43, 53.

[37] CC, Mar. 12, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[38] CC, Mar. 19, 1770, pp. 1-3.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[40] CC, Apr. 2, 1770, p. 3, Apr. 9, p. 3, Apr. 16, pp. 1, 3.

[41] CJ, Mar. 16, 1770, pp. 2-4, 1 of Supplement. Andrew, "News Dissemination," pp. 113, 118, erroneously states that this account was "embellished with additional details interspersed in the original Boston text." This is not the case. It was reprinted nearly verbatim with only an occasional word change.

[42] CJ, Mar. 23, 1770, p. 4, Mar. 30, p. 4, Apr. 6, pp. 1-2, Apr. 20, p. 3.

[43] NLG, Mar. 16, 1770, pp. 2-3.

[44] NLG, Mar. 23, 1770, p. 2, Mar. 30, p. 2, Apr. 6, p. 2.

[45] NLG, Apr. 6, 1770, p. 3, Apr. 13, p. 2, Apr. 20, p. 2.

[46] NLG, April 13, 1770, p. 2.

[47] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 111, 285; Davidson, *Propaganda*, pp. 229-30; Sidney Pomerantz, "The Patriot Newspapers and the American Revolution," in *The Era of the American Revolution*, ed. by Richard B. Morris (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 309; Brigham, *Bibliography*, I, pp. 636, 639, 655.

[48] NYJ, Mar. 15, 1770, p. 3.

[49] NYJ, Mar. 22, 1770, p. 2, Mar. 29, p. 1 of Supplement, Apr. 5, pp. 1-2.

[50] NYJ, Apr. 12, 1770, p. 8, Apr. 19, p. 2.

[51] NYPB, Mar. 19, 1770, p. 2, Apr. 2, p. 3.

[52] NYM, Mar. 19, 1770, pp. 1-2, Mar. 26, p. 1.

[53] NYM, Apr. 2, 1770, p. 2, Apr. 16, p. 3.

[54] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 113-17.

[55] Sidney Kobre, The Development of the Colonial Newspaper (Pittsburgh: Colonial Press, Inc., 1944), pp. 149-55; Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 285; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 230-31; Thomas, Printing, I, pp. 243-44, II, pp. 136-39.

[56] PC, Mar. 19, 1770, p. 2. Andrew, "News Dissemination," p. 114, erroneously says the first Philadelphia coverage appeared on March 22.

[57] PC, Mar. 26, 1770, pp. 1-4.

[58] PC, Apr. 2, 1770, p. 2, Apr. 16, pp. 1, 4. One or two-sentence articles also appeared on April 23 and 30.

[59] PJ, Mar. 22, 1770, pp. 3, 1 of Supplement. Andrew, "News Dissemination," pp. 114-15, attributes the source of this story as the Connecticut Journal. This is incorrect; the Connecticut Journal account came only from the Boston Gazette. (See note 41)

[60] PJ, Mar. 28, 1770, p. 2, Apr. 5, pp. 1-2, Apr. 12, p. 2, Apr. 26, p. 2 of Supplement.

[61] PG, Mar. 22, 1770, pp. 1-3.

[62] PG, Mar. 29, 1770, p. 2, Apr. 5, p. 2, Apr. 19, p. 2.

[63] Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 231-32; Kobre, Newspaper, p. 147; Thomas, Printing, I, pp. 335-36, II, pp. 163-64; Brigham, Bibliography, II, pp. 1159, 1161.

[64] VG(R), Mar. 29, 1770, p. 2. Andrew, "News Dissemination," p. 115, wrongly states that the first Virginia story appeared on April 5.

[65] VG(R), Apr. 5, 1770, pp. 2-4; VG(PD), Apr. 5, 1770, pp. 2-3, Apr. 19, pp. 2-3. Andrew, "News Dissemination," p. 115, mistakenly attributes the source for Rind's article as having been "reprinted from the New Haven version that had been published in the Pennsylvania Journal." We have already seen that the Pennsylvania Journal article was a composite; therefore it could not have come from the Connecticut paper. (See note 59) It is possible that the Virginia accounts derived from the Connecticut source, but editing precludes positive verification. The most that can be said is they originated in the Boston Gazette. If there was intermediate reprinting, it cannot be established.

[66] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 79, 126, 285; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 232-33; Thomas, Printing, I, pp. 343-45, II, pp. 170-73.

[67] Thomas, Printing, I, pp. 170-71. My research substantiates Thomas' statements. SCG, Mar. 14, 1771, is only one example of an issue filled with advertising.

[68] SCG, Apr. 5, 1770, pp. 1-2, May 17, p. 3.

[69] SCAG, Apr. 6, 1770, p. 2.

[70] SCCJ, Apr. 7, 1770, pp. 1-2.

[71] SCCJ, May 8, 1770, p. 2, May 17, p. 3, July 3, p. 2. For ship arrivals see Marine lists in SCCJ, May 1 and May 8.

[72] See Chapter I, note 35.

CHAPTER III

NEWSPAPERS ARGUE MURDER OR SELF-DEFENSE: SUMMER, 1770-WINTER, 1771

Ironically, on the same day of the killings in Boston, Lord North acted in England to remove part of the source of colonial discontent that had led to the Massacre. On March 5, 1770, he recommended repeal of all provisions of the revenue portion of the Townshend Acts except the duty on tea. Political in-fighting in England coupled with American opposition to the Revenue Act in the form of non-importation and inability of British colonial officials to enforce the act resulted in revokement a month later. This situation produced what one historian has called "a collapse" in American resistance to Great Britain which was to last for over two years.

Although non-importation contributed much to Great Britain's decision to repeal the Revenue Act, the internal fight in America over the policy tended to polarize sentiments there into opposing Whig and Tory camps. No unity of purpose similar to the opposition to the Stamp Act was present in the struggle against the Townshend duties. Much internal resentment to non-importation existed, particularly among merchants who were adversely affected by

the agreement. Actions of Samuel Adams and his Whig partisans in forcing through non-importation did not sit well with many influential Americans, who looked upon the activities of the more radical elements as beneath them. Mob action was not universally accepted by this segment of the society either. Many felt that violent activities would alienate Britain rather than wring concessions from her.[1]

Different public reaction to the Boston Massacre illustrated this growing internal division among Americans. The Whigs thought it epitomized British tyranny, while Tories believed it the culmination of agitation by a lawless mob against legally constituted government. Before the period of malaise could take full effect in Boston, that city had to resolve the guilt or innocence of those accused of the killings.

Following the affair, a combination of pressure from the Boston town meeting, led by Samuel Adams, and support from communities throughout Massachusetts forced Lieutenant-Governor Hutchinson to withdraw the British troops from the city. He initially ordered out only the 29th Regiment, whose men had been involved directly in the incident. A few days later, however, faced by an aroused countryside plus Adams' demands backed by several thousand men in Boston, Hutchinson withdrew the 14th as well. This action reduced tension somewhat, but the Whig leaders were

not content. They next pressed for a speedy trial of Preston, the soldiers, and those accused of aiding them by firing from the customs house.[2]

Hutchinson faced a difficult situation. He had to obtain a fair trial for the accused men when the explosive situation and temper of the people threatened their safety and fair treatment. He believed it essential to postpone the trials until the "heats on the minds of the people should abate." In this Hutchinson was supported by Tories in the colony including his friend Israel Williams, who wrote him stating the Massacre showed the society was "degenerating fast." With this backing by prominent Tories, Hutchinson resisted Whig demands, and delayed the trials for over six months. Then, too, he was able to separate the proceedings against Preston from those of the soldiers. Preston finally came to trial on October 24, 1770, with the enlisted men following a month later on November 27. Manwaring and the others were tried last, during the second week in December.[3]

John Adams was among those who believed the Massacre "had been intentionally wrought up by designing Men, who knew what they were aiming at better than the instrument employed."[4] His dislike of extreme measures coupled with a desire to see Boston provide the defendants as fair a trial as possible caused Adams to join with a second prominent Whig, Josiah Quincy, in representing Preston and the soldiers. Quincy likewise felt they were

entitled to the best possible defense.

Witnesses' testimony followed the basic arguments which had previously been established by both the newspaper accounts of the affair and opposing Whig and Tory pamphlets: A Short Narrative . . . and A Fair Account . . . . Preston simply denied he ordered his men to fire. Evidence left sufficient doubt that he issued the command, and he was acquitted. Quincy and Adams based their defense of the soldiers on the premise that they were sufficiently threatened by the mob to fear for their lives, thus firing in self-defense. This, coupled with the fact that only two of the soldiers could be positively identified as having shot a specific individual, resulted in acquittal for six and a verdict of manslaughter for the remaining two. Juries composed of all men from the country in the case of the soldiers and six each from country and city (the latter identified with Tory sentiments) may have helped the defendants. By invoking "benefit of clergy" (a plea for mercy) the guilty soldiers were sentenced to branding on the thumb.[5]

In the trial of those accused of firing from the customs house, the only evidence to support the charge was the testimony of the servant boy. When he was proved to have been elsewhere on the night of the killing, the jury acquitted the four without leaving their seats.[6]

The trials were a shock for the militant Whigs.

Samuel Adams launched a three-month campaign in the Boston Gazette in an attempt to persuade the people of the "miscarriage of justice." This in turn led Hutchinson to complain that Adams was "trying the Soldiers over again" in the press. Despite the outcome of the trials, Hutchinson felt the continued Whig exhortations caused the greater part of the people in Massachusetts to believe the acquittals unjust, and the killings continued to be known as "a horrid Massacre."[7]

News Coverage-General

Continued coverage of the Massacre by newspapers from the break in initial coverage of the incident through the aftermath of the trials may be divided into three periods, hereafter referred to as pretrial, trial, and post-trial. During the pretrial period (roughly beginning at the end of April) newspapers presented basic Whig and Tory positions regarding blame for the Massacre. Whig argument stressed the threat of standing armies to liberty and a preconceived plan by the soldiers to murder the townspeople of Boston. The Whigs dropped the theme of a double conspiracy involving the customs officials. Except for a brief moment in 1773, this theme does not reappear in writings about the Massacre. Tory material emphasized the town's hostility toward the military, while absolving the soldiers from blame for the killings by stressing the self-defensive nature of their action. The English press

provided the source for most of this give and take. Colonial writers contributed only one of four major articles which appeared in the colonial newspapers at this time.

While the trials were in session (trial period), newspapers mainly reported the proceedings in neutral accounts. Most stories, that is, told only of the convening of the trial, its continuation, length of jury deliberation, and verdicts. Arguments of the attorneys were not included. With the Boston Gazette a notable exception, only occasionally did the Boston-originated stories press a partisan view upon the reader.

Then, following the trials (post-trial period), while other Boston newspapers dropped the subject, the Evening-Post and Gazette returned to partisan journalism. Samuel Adams, as "Vindex," assisted by other militant Whigs, in a series of articles, tried to discredit the verdicts, while stressing the continued threat posed by the army. Massachusetts Attorney-General Jonathan Sewall, writing as "Philanthrop" in the Post, opposed Adams in another series. Sewall's newspaper rebuttal was the strongest Tory counter-effort to Whig writings about the Massacre to appear in colonial newspapers during the period covered by this study.[8]

While Massachusetts newspapers devoted considerable space to Massacre coverage during this period, Table 2

shows that little of this diffused throughout the colonies. Pretrial stories account for the bulk of Whig and Tory information printed by newspapers outside Massachusetts, while trial coverage constitutes most of the neutral articles which diffused. The newspaper battle between "Vindex" and "Philanthrop" was limited to Massachusetts. Not a single article of the series appeared outside the Bay Colony, nor did any newspaper even mention the controversy was going on.

TABLE 2

DIFFUSION OF NEWS STORIES REFERRING TO BOSTON MASSACRE DURING PRETRIAL, TRIAL, AND POST-TRIAL PERIODS: POLITICAL BIAS BY COLONY*

Bias	Mass.	Conn.	N. Y.	Pa.	Va.	S. C.
Tory	22	3	2	3	1	
Whig	41	8	3	3	1	1
Neutral	18	5	3	8	3	3

*Table 2 shows number of news stories one paragraph or greater in size which appeared in all newspapers from break in initial coverage of the Massacre itself through the break in post-trial coverage.

As with news about the Massacre itself, Connecticut and Pennsylvania led the other colonies in printing stories during the trial period. Connecticut readers got about the same balance as those in Massachusetts, but in greatly reduced amounts. Pennsylvania newspapers, however, provided more neutral accounts than those which advocated a

position. Of the latter type, they offered an equal number from each side--a significant departure from previous coverage. The New York press continued to balance its coverage in the small amount produced. Virginia and South Carolina newspapers printed so little during the period one must question whether their printers had any real interest left in the affair.

Massachusetts

Massachusetts was the only colony in which the newspaper situation changed during this period. In the summer of 1770 Boston lost a Tory sheet and gained a Whig voice. The *Chronicle* had been a favorite Whig target for many months, because it printed names of Whig merchants who violated non-importation. By June pressure on the paper became intolerable, and it ceased printing on the 25th. On July 17 Isaiah Thomas founded the *Massachusetts Spy* as a newspaper designed to reach the lower classes. Initially, Thomas hoped to be neutral, and assured the Tories he would not let the mob threaten him into performing otherwise. But he was too much a Whig and businessman to follow a neutral course very long. Within three months he was openly soliciting articles "supporting Liberty." The *Spy* would ultimately become a highly successful business enterprise among colonial newspapers, and rank with the *Boston Gazette* as the foremost advocate of Whig causes. With these changes, Boston papers lined up politically with two

Whig, two Tory, and one neutral.[9]

Four major articles--in addition to many minor ones--referring directly to the Massacre appeared in the Boston press during the pretrial period: one at the end of April, two in June, and the last in July. Three were reprints from London newspapers, while one gave the texts of an exchange of messages between Hutchinson and the Whig-controlled Massachusetts House of Representatives.

The only Tory view came in one of the London articles. It began with a summary of the basic Tory argument from the pamphlet, _A Fair Account . . . ._ stating ". . . the Conduct of the Town has been misrepresented in Regard to that tragical Scene." It charged that a "Plan had been preconcerted for attacking the Troops on that or the succeeding night. . . ." To this was added "The Case of Captain Thomas Preston," a deposition taken by the Tories from the accused officer in the Boston jail. In it he denied ordering his men to fire or even to load their weapons. Preston further complained of "Malcontents" among the people who infused "the utmost Malice and Revenge into the Minds of the People who are to be my Jurors. . . ." The "Case" ended with Preston fearing for his life.

Massachusetts newspapers played this article two ways. Those that wanted to point out the contradiction between this statement and Preston's earlier expression of thanks to the town reprinted his original letter along with

the "Case." It is not known what effect--if any--this had on readers. Without any attempt to explain the relationship between the two statements, the Whig effort seems minimal. The pamphlet summary and the "Case" filled nearly two full columns, while the original letter was but a single short paragraph. By eliminating the original letter, the News-Letter made no attempt to discredit the article.[10]

The other three articles stressed the Whig view of the Massacre as a preconceived plan by the soldiers to murder the inhabitants, and emphasized the threat of the army to liberty. In the exchange between Hutchinson and the House, the lieutenant-governor complained of violence done in Glocester by a mob in defiance of "the Laws and the Authority of Government." In its reply a House committee, which included John Hancock and Joseph Warren, defended the citizens. Their message noted "they seldom if ever assembled in tumultuous manner unless oppressed . . . while under the hand of tyranny and arbitrary power. . . ." To the committee, the arbitrary power was a "Standing Army designed to subjugate the people . . . in Defiance of the Laws and Authority of Government," resulting in (among a long list of grievances) "the most horrid Slaughter of a Number of Inhabitants." Thus, the Whigs again tied the Massacre to a larger threat to freedom.[11]

One of the accounts from the London papers told of

the arrival there of Boston's schooner Betsey, carrying reports that "soldiers of the 29th Regiment had been heard to declare, ten days before the massacre, that the streets of Boston would flow with blood on the 5th of March." Later the Boston papers reprinted a London article by the "North Briton" who stated, after "giving a long Account of the several Nations, who have lost their Freedom by means of standing Armies," that the "BOSTON . . . tragedy is at once the most bloody, most cruel and cowardly of any, as a preconcerted scheme . . . by the army for murdering the greatest part, if not the whole of the inhabitants." By these two articles, the Boston papers again told their readers they were in grave danger from the soldiers among them.[12]

Each newspaper handled these four articles differently. Only the Gazette and Evening-Post printed all of them. Presentation in each was identical, except that the Post's introduction to the "North Briton" was shorter than the Gazette's. On July 9, along with the "North Briton," the Gazette also printed a "Letter from a Gentleman in London." Other statements to the contrary aside, "Gentleman" believed "the narrative sent home by the town" correctly represented the affair as the soldiers' fault. Although it did print a Tory article at this time, the Post continued to emphasize the Whig position as it had done with its earlier Massacre coverage. The Gazette continued

to lead the Whig persuasive effort.[13]

Boston's two Tory papers did not publish all of these articles. The *Chronicle* printed the exchange between Hutchinson and the House, while the *News-Letter* did likewise. Draper also printed Preston's "Case," following it, in late September, with another deposition from the *Fair Account . . .* . This latter article again stressed the culpability of the townspeople in the killings. The *Chronicle* certainly did not help the soldiers' cause with the story it printed. Draper's effort, however, was more in keeping with his reputation than his previous coverage had been. But overall, the *News-Letter* lagged as a Tory voice.[14]

In Salem, the *Essex Gazette* played these stories differently than the *Boston Gazette*, which it previously had followed so closely. Hall printed the summary of *A Fair Account . . .* on a different page from Preston's "Case," adding the original jail letter on yet a third page. On July 10, Hall extracted the "North Briton" from the *Boston Gazette* of the day before. While continuing to take his accounts from Edes and Gill, Hall balanced his coverage at this time by restricting the number of Whig articles he reprinted.[15]

As was earlier pointed out, the bulk of coverage in the Massachusetts papers while the trials were in session was neutral. The *News-Letter* departed from this stance

twice and the Evening-Post only once. Between the trials of Preston and the soldiers, Draper printed a letter from London in which the writer said a new fleet and army would be sent to Boston at the time of Preston's trial to ensure his safety should he be convicted and subsequently pardoned by the King. This turned out to be unfounded rumor. Then, in its announcement of the verdict in Manwaring's trial, the News-Letter added the opinion that the case was dismissed because "no doubt existed that no firing came from the Customs-House." On the other hand, the Evening-Post sounded a Whig note by reporting a London article in which "Barneveldt" urged that charges contained in Boston's original letter to England be "substantiated by results of the trials."[16]

During the trial period, the Boston Gazette ignored the conduct of the proceedings completely. Instead, it kept up a steady barrage of articles supporting the Whig contention that the soldiers were entirely to blame for the Massacre, and their larger mission was subjecting the town to the Crown's will. One account cited several depositions from A Short Narrative . . . charging the soldiers with a preplan for murder, while another pointed to the now-familiar threat to liberty of a standing army. On the day prior to the beginning of proceedings against the soldiers, an article predicted their defense would either be "orders to fire from Preston" or making the town seem the

aggressors. The article also presented an emotional appeal for justice. It invoked the memory of Christopher Monk, who "still survives, the Wounds receiv'd in the horrible Massacre, and lives to see the Death of his Fellow Sufferers is not yet reveng'd. . . ." Finally, the Whig writer asked blood for blood as he wondered whether "there was any Murder" committed, and "Whether the Dogs greedily licking human blood in King-Street . . . is any Thing more than a Dream." Then, in the middle of the trial, Sam Adams as "A Chatterer" emphasized the need to remove the "threat to liberty" from among the people. Thus, the Gazette pushed hard to discredit the soldiers as they stood trial for their lives.[17]

The remaining Massachusetts newspapers merely reported the progress of the trials. In Boston that included the Post-Boy and the Massachusetts Spy. Over in Salem, the Essex Gazette, for the first time in its coverage of the Massacre, went to other than the Boston Gazette for its stories. Hall used both the Evening-Post and News-Letter as sources for articles he printed about the trials.[18]

The newspaper controversy (following the trials) between Sam Adams as "Vindex," supported by other Whig writers, and Jonathan Sewall as "Philanthrop" swelled the amount of exposure to the Massacre for Massachusetts citizens. However, the combined Whig effort more than

doubled the Tory output. Coupled with earlier dominance of Whig writings, this added quantity validates Hutchinson's opinion that the Whig view prevailed in Massachusetts.

Beyond increased exposure to the Massacre, the series interests us because of the role the Evening-Post played in it. "Philanthrop" appeared exclusively in the Fleets' paper, thus balancing to some degree the previously Whig view of the affair it presented. The Evening-Post did not eliminate Whig articles, however. It also printed "Detector" and "An Inhabitant of Boston" as counters to "Philanthrop." The Fleets' willingness to fight the Gazette in this matter, yet offer Whig rebuttal at the same time, substantiates historians' claims that the Evening-Post was basically neutral in its political position.[19]

The series is also important because it permits the first specific identification of writers on both sides. Previously, all locally written Massacre articles had been anonymous. Besides Adams and Jonathan Sewall, Dr. Thomas Young wrote as "An Inhabitant of Boston." Unfortunately, other Whigs writing as "Detector," "Philalethes," "A Mechanic," and "Philo Patraie" cannot be identified.[20]

With one exception, the other Boston papers avoided the controversy. The News-Letter did get involved in a small way. On December 27, Draper refused to print a Tory parody on "Vindex." A week later, however, he succumbed to

pressure of those who said he was wrong to judge what he would print, and ran the poem.[21]

Outside Boston, the *Essex Gazette* printed two "Vindex" and two "Philanthrop" articles along with the *News-Letter* parody and Dr. Young's piece. With this balanced coverage, Hall repeated the neutral style he had earlier adopted.[22]

The post-trial argument ended newspaper coverage of the Massacre trials. Massachusetts readers had received continued exposure to the affair over an extended period of time. In fact, a comparison of Tables 1 and 2 shows more articles appeared during the period with which this chapter deals than in coverage of the incident itself. A substantial Tory view of the affair was also presented. Except for the *Boston Gazette*, Massachusetts newspapers provided essentially neutral coverage, balancing Whig and Tory articles. By its strict adherence to the Whig view, the *Gazette* emerges as the champion of that cause. No Tory paper came close to equaling it, and the number of pro-Whig articles it printed was double the quantity the *Evening-Post* provided as a voice for the other side.

In the following examination of diffusion outside Massachusetts, the reader should guard against allowing detailed description of coverage in each newspaper to imply greater importance of the Massacre to each colony than warranted. He (or she) should keep Table 2 in mind, and

remember that the entire post-trial argument between the *Boston Gazette* and the *Evening-Post* did not diffuse.

Connecticut

In Connecticut, the Whig view continued to dominate overall newspaper coverage of the Massacre during this time. However, New Haven and Hartford readers got some Tory news of the affair.

Although the reply of the Massachusetts House of Representatives to Hutchinson's complaint of violence in Glocester provided one of the fullest Whig statements about the threat of standing armies, no Connecticut newspaper reprinted it. Of the four pretrial articles, the *Connecticut Courant* printed Preston's "Case" and the "North Briton"--the latter taken from the *Boston Gazette*. In New Haven, the Greens gave their *Journal* readers another look at the Whig conception of the soldiers' premeditated plan for murder by reprinting the account of Captain Gardner's arrival in London. The *Journal* also printed Preston's "Case." Both the *Courant* and the *Journal* published this latter article without Preston's original letter. Thus, these papers provided one Whig and one Tory view of fault for the Massacre. The *New-London Gazette* gave its readers no such balance, as it reprinted the *Boston Gazette*'s introduction to the "North Briton," Gardner's arrival in London, and "A Letter from a Gentleman in London."[23]

remember that the entire post-trial argument between the Boston Gazette and the Evening-Post did not diffuse.

Connecticut

In Connecticut, the Whig view continued to dominate overall newspaper coverage of the Massacre during this time. However, New Haven and Hartford readers got some Tory news of the affair.

Although the reply of the Massachusetts House of Representatives to Hutchinson's complaint of violence in Gloucester provided one of the fullest Whig statements about the threat of standing armies, no Connecticut newspaper reprinted it. Of the four pretrial articles, the Connecticut Courant printed Preston's "Case" and the "North Briton"--the letter taken from the Boston Gazette. In New Haven, the Greens gave their Journal readers another look at the Whig conception of the soldiers' premeditated plan for murder by reprinting the account of Captain Gardner's arrival in London. The Journal also printed Preston's "Case." Both the Courant and the Journal published this letter article without Preston's original letter. Thus, these papers provided one Whig and one Tory view of guilt for the Massacre. The New-London Gazette gave its readers no such balance, as it reprinted the Boston Gazette's introduction to the "North Briton," Gardner's arrival in London, and "A Letter from a Gentleman in London."[23]

For the trial period, all Connecticut papers coupled neutral reports of the proceedings with the *Boston Gazette*'s article speculating on the defense of the soldiers. Additionally, one single-paragraph article favoring a Tory view of the trials appeared in the *Journal* on December 21. After reporting Manwaring's verdict, the Greens reprinted a story defending the fairness of the trials. This article had earlier appeared in both the *Boston Evening-Post* and the *Post-Boy*.[24]

New York

John Holt maintained his neutral position on the Massacre with his spare coverage of various aspects of the trial story. For the entire period the *Journal* printed only four articles. Two merely announced conduct of the proceedings. Earlier, Holt gave his readers the House reply to Hutchinson's violence complaint and Preston's "Case." He took the latter account from the *News-Letter*.[25]

Hugh Gaine printed the same pretrial articles in his *New York Mercury* that Holt gave his *Journal* readers, adding one other of Whig bias. On June 25, a week after it had appeared in the Boston papers, he told of the soldiers' preplan to "murder" the inhabitants, by reprinting the account of the *Betsey*'s arrival in London. Gaine's coverage matched what he had earlier provided about the incident itself. While paying scant attention to the affair, he slightly favored the Whigs.[26]

Pennsylvania

All three Pennsylvania papers handled pretrial coverage essentially the same way. Each offered its readers one of the three Whig articles, along with portions of Preston's "Case." Both Goddard and the Bradfords printed the Massachusetts House reply to Hutchinson's violence complaint as their Whig illustration of the ultimate consequences of a standing army stationed among the people. By printing the account of Gardner's arrival in London, Hall and Sellers again told their readers about the soldiers' premeditated plan to murder the citizens. In reproducing Preston's "Case," all papers deleted his original jail letter. The Chronicle also left off the summary of A Fair Account . . . , which had appeared in the Boston original.[27]

Each paper reported progress of the trials in about the same number of neutral articles. Only the individual stories selected differed from paper to paper. Overall, Pennsylvania newspapers balanced Whig and Tory accounts through this period--a significant departure from their earlier efforts, which had heavily favored the Whigs.

Virginia

Virginia's two Gazettes showed so little interest in the Massacre during the trial period, they failed to report the proceedings against the soldiers. Both papers gave one paragraph each to the verdicts in the cases of

Preston and Manwaring. Because Purdie and Dixon used the Boston News-Letter version of the latter, their readers also got some Tory comment on the results of that trial. Earlier Rind had printed the only pretrial article to appear in Virginia. On August 2 he reproduced the Boston Gazette's "London Gentleman's" letter, backing the Whig contention that the soldiers were to blame for the Massacre.[28]

South Carolina

Coverage in the Charleston newspapers was so sparse during this period that South Carolina readers barely learned that Preston and the soldiers had been tried for the killings. The papers ignored Manwaring's trial completely. Somewhat surprisingly, the American General Gazette was the only paper to print other than neutral trial stories. That Tory sheet presented a Whig view of the affair by reprinting the House reply to Hutchinson's complaint of violence in Glocester. As with Virginia, it seems South Carolina printers lacked any real interest in the affair at this time.[29]

Summary

Newspapers in Massachusetts continued to show a high degree of interest in the Massacre during this period. In comparison with earlier reporting of the incident itself, the number of articles nearly doubled. Moreover, a new dimension was added when a substantial Tory

counter-argument to the Whig assertion that the soldiers were entirely at fault for the affair emerged in the press.

Whigs, principally using the Boston Gazette, sought to discredit the defendants before and during the trials by hammering at two themes: the danger to liberty inherent in a standing army and the soldiers' premeditated plan to murder the inhabitants of Boston. When the verdicts went against Whig desires, Samuel Adams led a three-month newspaper vendetta against the army and conduct of the trials. Whig argument deleted reference to a conspiracy with customs officials, and this theme only appears one more time in the next four years.

The Tory counterattack began slowly during the pretrial period, as two articles argued that the townspeople were the aggressors causing the soldiers to fear for their lives that night in King Street. Tories viewed the shootings as the unfortunate result of soldiers defending themselves against a violent, unlawful mob. In response to Adams' Gazette attack following the trials, Massachusetts Attorney-General Jonathan Sewall answered the charges on this basis in the Evening-Post.

Except for the Gazette and Evening-Post, other Massachusetts newspapers paid less attention to the Massacre during the trial period than previously. And their coverage was basically neutral, as they either balanced Whig articles with Tory ones or merely reported

the conduct of the trials. Thus, the Boston Gazette emerges as an uncompromising advocate of the Whig cause, while the Evening-Post reasserted a neutral position by printing the bulk of the Tory argument along with some Whig.

Outside Massachusetts, newspaper interest in the Massacre abated during the period. Pennsylvania newspapers printed only half the number of articles they had previously offered following the incident itself. Connecticut, while printing nearly as many articles as in earlier coverage, provided their readers with less than twenty-five per cent of what appeared in Massachusetts. Earlier they had reprinted approximately half of the Massachusetts material. In the South, coverage was so spare that one must question whether printers there had any real interest in the trials.

Furthermore, coverage throughout the other colonies was basically neutral, with only the Connecticut newspapers printing more Whig accounts than Tory or neutral. Even the strong Whig papers provided a balanced view, with the New-London Gazette the only one to offer its readers a dominantly Whig picture of the soldiers' guilt. Perhaps most significant in terms of lack of interest shown in the Massacre beyond Massachusetts at this time was the failure of any newspaper outside the Bay Colony to reprint any of the newspaper battle following the trials.

Everything reported outside Boston had earlier appeared in that city's newspapers. There was no other source; even the London-originated stories had first appeared in Boston, as shown by the Boston datelines with which non-Boston papers headed these accounts.

Boston sources for articles appearing in newspapers outside Massachusetts were somewhat different from those previously used. In the case of biased material, the *Gazette* was used most often for Whig articles, and the *News-Letter* for Tory. Since the *Gazette* did not print any neutral accounts, printers who had made extensive use of its material previously had to go elsewhere for stories about the trials. Here they divided about equally between the *Evening-Post* and the *News-Letter*.

Despite the outcome of the trials, Whig leaders in Massachusetts did not let the matter of the Boston Massacre rest. In 1771 they initiated a series of commemorative celebrations which lasted until 1783. These annual events form phase three of the Massacre story. We next examine what information the colonial newspapers carried about them.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1] Jensen, Founding, pp. 184, 313-33, 354-72; Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 24.

[2] D. L. Marsh and W. H. Clark (eds.), The Story of Massachusetts, Vol. I (New York: The American Historical Society, 1938), p. 271; Jensen, Founding, pp. 52-53, 407-09.

[3] BNL, Sept. 20, 1770, p. 1; Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, ed. by L. S. Mayo, Vol. III (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 207; Letter of Williams to Hutchinson, June 26, 1770, cited in Lee N. Newcomer, Embattled Farmers (New York: King's Crown Press, 1953), p. 28; Zobel, Massacre, pp. 206-40, provides a full description of these pretrial proceedings.

[4] Butterfield (ed.), Adams Diary, III, p. 292.

[5] See text above note 22 in Chapter II for some of this argument. Other newspaper accounts stressing the opposing views will shortly be discussed in this chapter, while the pamphlets are more fully discussed in Chapter V. Zobel, Massacre, pp. 241-94, gives a detailed account of the trials. He believes the Crown "packed" the juries to offset Whig sentiment. Wroth and Zobel (eds.), Adams Legal Papers contains the most complete record of the trials available; defense summations are also found in David Potter and Thomas L. Gordon, The Colonial Idiom (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), pp. 95-132, and Josiah Quincy, The Memoir of Josiah Quincy, Junior of Massachusetts Bay, 1744-1775, 3d ed. by Eliza Susan Quincy (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1875), pp. 30-49.

[6] Jensen, Founding, pp. 409-10; Zobel, Massacre, pp. 295-97.

[7] Hutchinson to Israel Williams, cited in Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 135; Hutchinson, History, III, p. 237. Adams' actions following the trials do not square with his earlier feelings about the soldiers' actions. On November 16, 1770, he wrote Stephen Sayre in London that it was Preston's duty to protect the sentry, and he presumed the people were the aggressors. At that time he believed this principle would clear them. Letter contained in

Harry A. Cushing (ed.), The Writings of Samuel Adams, Vol. III (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906), pp. 59-60.

[8] References for these generalizations and identities of the writers will be cited during detailed discussion of these articles.

[9] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 107-08, 130-31; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 228-29; Shipton, Thomas, pp. 17-30; Brigham, Bibliography, I, pp. 319-20.

[10] BG, June 25, 1770, pp. 1-2 of Supplement; BNL, June 21, 1770, pp. 5-6 of Extraordinary.

[11] BG, Apr. 30, 1770, p. 1.

[12] Ibid., June 18, 1770, p. 1, July 9, p. 4.

[13] BG, Apr. 30, 1770, p. 1, June 18, p. 1, June 25, pp. 1-2 of Supplement, Jul. 9, p. 3; BEP, Apr. 30, 1770, p. 3, June 18, p. 1 of Supplement, June 25, pp. 1-2 of Supplement, July 9, p. 2.

[14] BNL, Apr. 26, 1770, p. 3, June 21, pp. 5-6 of Extraordinary, Sept. 27, p. 4; BC, Apr. 30, 1770, p. 4.

[15] EG, June 26, 1770, p. 2, July 10, p. 2.

[16] BNL, Dec. 13, 1770, p. 3, Nov. 22, p. 4; BEP, Nov. 26, 1770, p. 1.

[17] BG, Sept. 24, 1770, p. 2, Oct. 1, p. 3, Nov. 26, p. 3, Dec. 3, p. 1; Cushing (ed.), Adams Writings, pp. 35-43, 70, reproduces the articles Sam Adams wrote in the Gazette under this pseudonym.

[18] BPB, Oct. 29, 1770, p. 3, Nov. 5, p. 3, Dec. 3, p. 3, Dec. 10, p. 3, Dec. 17, p. 3; MS, Nov. 29, 1770, p. 3, Dec. 7, pp. 1, 4, Dec. 13, p. 3, Dec. 17, p. 3; EG, Oct. 30, 1770, p. 3, Dec. 4, p. 3, Dec. 18, p. 3.

[19] The individual articles are too numerous to cite in detail. They appeared in the Gazette and Evening-Post almost every week between Dec. 10, 1770, and Mar. 4, 1771. Whig articles in the EP appeared on Feb. 11 and Feb. 25, 1771.

[20] Cushing (ed.), Adams Writings, reproduces the "Vindex" series on pp. 77-162; Harbottle Dorr, Annotated Massachusetts Newspapers, p. 325, also identifies Sam Adams as "Vindex" and on p. 469, Dr. Young as "An Inhabitant." William V. Wells, The Life and Public

Services of Samuel Adams, Vol. I (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1866), pp. 331, 379, 445, lists twenty-five aliases under which Adams wrote, pp. 379, 445 identify Sewall as "Philanthrop." John Cary, *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961), pp. 54-73, says this famous Whig also wrote extensively in the *Gazette*. However, none of Warren's pseudonyms match those of the Whig articles appearing at this time.

[21] BNL, Dec. 27, 1770, p. 4, Jan. 3, 1771, p. 2.

[22] BG, Dec. 25, 1770, p. 4, Jan. 8, 1771, p. 1, Feb. 5, p. 3.

[23] CJ, June 22, 1770, p. 4, June 29, pp. 1-2; CC, July 2, 1770, p. 4, July 12, p. 4; NLG, June 22, 1770, p. 2, July 13, pp. 2-3.

[24] CC, Dec. 4, 1770, p. 3, Dec. 25, p. 3; CJ, Nov. 2, 1770, p. 3, Nov. 9, p. 2, Nov. 30, p. 3, Dec. 21, p. 3; NLG, Nov. 9, 1770, p. 3, Nov. 30, p. 3, Dec. 7, p. 3, Dec. 17, p. 3.

[25] NYJ, May 10, 1770, p. 1, July 5, p. 5, Dec. 6, p. 3, Mar. 28, 1771, p. 5.

[26] NYM, May 7, 1770, p. 1, June 25, p. 3, July 2, p. 2.

[27] PC, May 21, 1770, p. 1, July 9, p. 1, Nov. 5, p. 2, Nov. 12, p. 3, Dec. 10, p. 2, Dec. 17, p. 2, Dec. 31, p. 3; PJ, May 10, 1770, pp. 1-2, July 5, pp. 1, 4, Nov. 8, p. 3, Nov. 15, p. 3, Dec. 13, p. 2, Dec. 27, p. 3; PG, June 28, 1770, p. 2, July 5, p. 1, Nov. 15, p. 3, Dec. 13, p. 2, Dec. 20, p. 1.

[28] VG(R), Aug. 2, 1770, p. 1, Nov. 29, p. 1, Jan. 17, 1771, p. 1; VG(PD), Nov. 29, 1770, p. 1, Jan. 17, 1771, p. 1.

[29] SCG, Jan. 31, 1771, p. 1; SCCJ, Oct. 9, 1770, p. 2, Jan. 8, 1771, p. 2; SCAG, May 30, 1770, p. 1.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESS REMEMBERS THE MASSACRE, 1771-1775

With the troops gone and the murder trials complete, Boston, like the rest of the colonies, settled into relative calm for a period of more than two years. As long as British soldiers remained in America, however, Massachusetts Whig leaders saw them as a continuing threat to liberty. In order to keep this danger before the public the Whigs created an annual commemorative celebration of the Boston Massacre as a vehicle for reminder. Samuel Adams summed up the purpose of the anniversary "as designed to preserve in the Minds of the People a lively Sense of the Danger of standing Armies."[1]

The time frame of this chapter overlaps that of Chapter III by five weeks, because the proposals for the anniversary celebrations appeared in February, 1771, during the post-trial period. Although historians differ as to whether Adams or Josiah Quincy was the individual actually responsible for suggesting the event, Quincy was the first to publicly propose it. As "Mentor" writing "to the Publishers" in the <u>Boston Evening-Post</u> on February 11, 1771, he asked for an annual celebration of the "5th of March" to show the "fatal effects of the policy of standing

armies." Quincy was not the only one to speak in public on the subject. The next day an anonymous writer from New Hampshire asked Samuel Hall to "insert the following" proposal for a celebration of "March 5 . . . as a warning to all generations to come to guard against the fatal effects of standing armies" into his Essex Gazette. A week later both the Boston Gazette and Evening-Post repeated the call by reprinting this article. In the same issue of the Evening-Post, "O!" agreed with "Mentor's" original suggestion.[2]

In answer to these proposals the Boston town meeting formed a committee to devise a format for the anniversary event. The result was a standard celebration which began at noon with ringing of the town's bells for an hour, and ended at nine in the evening in the same manner. In between a commemorative oration was delivered and lighted displays shown. The speeches were originally planned to be delivered at Faneuil Hall, but the crowd at the first one was so large it was transferred to the Old South Church. This became the permanent site. Prominent Boston Whigs gave the orations. In 1771 James Lovell spoke, followed in 1772 by Joseph Warren, who repeated in 1775. The year 1773 saw Benjamin Church orate, with John Hancock filling the pulpit in 1774.

The lighted displays were set up for viewing after dark. In 1771, Paul Revere's house was the site. The following year they were switched to the balcony of

Mrs. Clapham's boarding house, located in King Street near the scene of the Massacre, where they were shown thereafter. While varying slightly from year to year, the displays usually depicted the Massacre scene, including the soldiers firing and the casualties lying on the ground or falling with blood flowing from open wounds. This was accompanied by a scene of grieving friends and a monument inscribed with the names of those killed. A third display showed a figure of a woman (representing America) sitting on a stump with her foot upon the head of a prostrate British soldier, pointing at the scene. Above all this appeared various poems memorializing the affair.[3]

Both the orations and displays attracted large crowds, variously described by the newspapers as "a vast Concourse," "A numerous and crowded Assembly," and "a great Part of the Representative body of the province." Whig merchant John Rowe estimated the gathering at more than 4,000 for Warren's 1772 speech. In 1773 the crowd was so large that speaker Benjamin Church and John Hancock, moderator for the oration, reached the pulpit only by coming through a window.[4]

Other Massachusetts towns also held commemorations. In 1771 Salem conducted a celebration, as did Newburyport in 1774 and 1775. However, public communications media give no indication that events of this sort took place in any other colony. Likewise, no secondary source consulted

by this writer mentions commemoration of the Boston Massacre in any colony other than Massachusetts. Furthermore, the newspaper proposals for the anniversaries did not diffuse.[5]

While this chapter deals primarily with commemorative events as a source of news in the colonial press about the Massacre, three other events caused public mention of the affair during the period. In March, 1771, Charles Bourgette, Manwaring's servant, was tried for perjuring himself at his master's hearing. This trial resulted in some Tory publicity appearing in the newspapers at the time of the first anniversary of the Massacre.[6]

Then, in 1773, the Massacre was referred to in a series of "Resolves" of the Massachusetts House of Representatives condemning some letters written in 1768 and 1769 by several prominent Massachusetts Tories. In these letters, Lieutenant-Governor Thomas Hutchinson, Andrew Oliver, secretary of the governor's council, and custom commissioner Charles Paxton (among others) wrote to England about their distrust for the people of Boston. "Hutchinson's Letters," as they came to be called, took a superior tone and talked of the necessity of controlling the "licentious" townspeople with British troops. Benjamin Franklin obtained these letters in London and sent them to Samuel Adams. Adams thought the letters showed a "design . . . to introduce arbitrary power into the province," and

that the writers were part of a plot against Boston. Adams and the Boston committee of correspondence published the "Resolves" and the "Letters" in both the newspapers and a pamphlet.[7]

Finally, for several months in early 1775, John Adams, as "Novanglus," argued the validity of America's grievances with Great Britain in a newspaper debate with Tory Daniel Leonard as "Massachusettensis." In his argument, Adams referred to the Massacre as the consequence of troops being introduced into the province, while Leonard charged the Whigs with using the commemorations to play on the emotions of the people. These three references to the Massacre will be discussed in conjunction with newspaper coverage of the annual celebrations of the event.[8]

News Coverage--General

News coverage of the Massacre anniversaries stressed one basic theme: the standing army was the instrument by which Great Britain sought to force the American people to submit to her wishes; if they did not, they would be killed. The theme was established in the proposals for the celebrations and carried through the reports of them. Newspaper descriptions of the displays would continue to blame the soldiers for the Massacre, and "Hutchinson's Letters" momentarily revived the idea of a larger conspiracy. But the threat of the standing army was what news coverage of the celebrations emphasized.

With reporting of the 1771 celebration, this coverage established a pattern which prevailed throughout the period. Anywhere from a few days to several months prior to the anniversary date, the Boston press would announce a town meeting for the purpose of requesting a "gentleman" to provide an oration commemorating the "barbarous Murder . . . and to impress upon our Minds the ruinous Tendency of Standing Armies in free Cities. . . ." This would be followed by an announcement of the Whig leader selected to deliver the address on the "dangerous Tendency of *Standing Armies* to the *Rights of Civil Society*." After the celebration, the papers described the displays and reported the oration with its subject: exposing the dangerous ". . . Policy of posting Standing Armies in Free Cities." Surprisingly, however, only Joseph Warren's 1775 oration was printed in the newspapers. For the most part these stories were short--one to three paragraphs in length--nothing like those which earlier took several columns to report the killings.[9]

In 1771 and 1772 several commemorative proclamations also appeared in the press along with standard reporting of the celebration. On these occasions the columns of the newspapers carrying them were suitably black-bordered, and printers made liberal use of large-point type and italics for added emphasis. After 1772, however, this practice ceased.

We have already seen that no colony outside Massachusetts celebrated the anniversary of the Massacre. Table 3 also shows the relatively small amount of news about the Bay Colony's commemorations which diffused. Remembering that Table 3 covers a four-year period, the number of articles appearing in New York, Virginia, and South Carolina is hardly of consequence. As with coverage of the pretrial, trial, and post-trial periods, only Connecticut and Pennsylvania printers thought the anniversary celebrations significant enough to provide their readers relatively substantial coverage of them. But the number of articles appearing in those colonies pales before what the Massachusetts press printed.

TABLE 3

DIFFUSION OF NEWS STORIES ABOUT THE BOSTON MASSACRE DURING ANNIVERSARY PERIOD: POLITICAL BIAS BY COLONY*

Bias	Mass.	Conn.	N. Y.	Pa.	Va.	S. C.
Tory	5		1			
Whig	70	17	2	19	3	5
Neutral						

*Table 3 shows number of news stories one paragraph or greater in size which appeared in all newspapers subsequent to the end of post-trial coverage. It also includes those few articles proposing the anniversary celebrations which appeared during the earlier period and were left out of Table 2.

Table 3 also shows that the Tories offered meagre opposition to the Whig effort at publicizing the threat of standing armies. Of the six Tory articles which appeared during this period, only three of five in Massachusetts concerned the celebrations. The other two Massachusetts articles referred to Bourgette's trial. The Whig polemics in Massachusetts newspapers substantiates Hutchinson's earlier claim that the prevailing view was that of a "horrid Massacre."[10]

Changes in the Status of Newspapers

Before beginning a discussion of how the individual newspapers reported the commemorations, a few words about the papers' changing status may be helpful. In Massachusetts the character of the *Boston Post-Boy* altered after April 26, 1773, when Nathaniel Mills and John Hicks took over the paper. The new printers, combined with what Isaiah Thomas described as a "number of military writers," gave the paper a more strident Tory tone. Mills and Hicks increased local coverage, putting Boston news on page one. At the same time, they all but eliminated the previously dominant London news. By 1775 they were doing such a good job for the Tories that Daniel Leonard's "Massachusettensis" series ran in the *Post-Boy*.[11]

Also in 1773, Isaiah Thomas answered requests of Whigs in Newburyport to start a paper there. On December 4

he began the Essex Journal in partnership with Henry Tinges, promising to print both sides of the political argument. As with the Massachusetts Spy, however, his new venture shortly became a Whig voice. Over the next year, Tinges printed the paper while Thomas remained in Boston. Then in August, 1774, Thomas sold his interest to Ezra Lunt.[12]

Meanwhile, Richard Draper died in Boston in May, 1774, after a long illness. His widow, Margaret, joined John Boyle (Draper's partner of one month) in continuing the News-Letter.[13]

One newspaper came and went in Massachusetts during the period. In Salem, Ezekiel Russell founded the Salem Gazette on July 1, 1774, as Tory competition to the Essex Gazette. It lasted less than ten months, expiring on April 21, 1775--two days after war began.[14]

Connecticut also gained and lost a newspaper, while a second changed its name. James Robertson founded the Norwich Packet in that city in 1773. This paper, the only Tory sheet in the colony, lasted until early 1775. It was not available for this study, however. In New London, Timothy Green began calling his Whig paper the Connecticut Gazette on December 17, 1773.[15]

The Hudson River valley in New York got a newspaper in late 1771, when Alexander and James Robertson established their Albany Gazette on November 25. It supported

the Tory side, but went out of business in August, 1772. The Tories gained a powerful and lasting voice in New York City, however, when James Rivington founded his *Gazetteer* on April 22, 1773. Rivington proved as troublesome to the Whigs in New York as John Mein earlier had been in Boston. A year later the *Gazetteer*'s Tory voice was so strong that Whigs took action to bar it from South Carolina and Connecticut. Also in 1773, three months after the *Gazetteer* appeared, the *Post-Boy* ceased to print.[16]

Philadelphia added yet another Whig organ to its newspaper family in October, 1771, when John Dunlap began printing his *Pennsylvania Packet*. The colony also lost a Whig paper--on February 8, 1774--as William Goddard closed the doors of his *Chronicle*. Early in 1775 two newspapers which were to have some import in later years also commenced printing. These were the *Pennsylvania Evening-Post*, founded by Goddard's ex-associate, Benjamin Towne, and the *Pennsylvania Ledger* of James Humphreys. Neither paper had really established a reputation by the time warfare began.[17]

In Virginia, the *Gazette* picture muddled further. On June 9, 1774, William Duncan founded a Whig newspaper in Norfolk called the *Virginia Gazette*, or the *Norfolk Intelligencer*. It lasted until April, 1775, when its press was stolen by Lord Dunmore and began printing for the Tories. Meanwhile, in Williamsburg, William Rind died on

August 26, 1773. His widow, Clementina, printed the Gazette until September, 1774, when she turned it over to John Pinkney. Then on February 3, 1775, Alexander Purdie dissolved his partnership with William Dixon and founded still another Virginia Gazette of his own. Dixon then picked up William Hunter as a partner in the old paper.[18]

Massachusetts

Newspaper coverage of the Massacre anniversaries in the Bay Colony reveals several interesting points about the newspapers there. First, the Boston Gazette did not dominate the Whig scene as it had in the past. Not that the Gazette did less than before, but the Massachusetts Spy and Essex Gazette did more. Rather than follow the Boston Gazette's lead, these other papers initiated printing of articles about the Massacre. A contributing factor to this may have been the relationship between the different printing days of the various newspapers and the day of the week on which the anniversary fell. Over the four-year period, papers to first print an account of the celebration were those with a printing day closest to the anniversary date. Then, too, both the Essex Gazette and the Essex Journal were located in towns which conducted their own celebrations, thus giving these newspapers local events to report. Also, the Essex Gazette had New Hampshire contributors who provided the Halls with Portsmouth news before it got to Boston. Overall, this period shows much

more reprinting among the Massachusetts newspapers than had previously occurred.

Dominance of Whig-biased material must have created a real problem for Tory printers. Their alternatives to printing Whig accounts were to ignore them or edit out the Whig flavor. Apparently they did neither, because their articles read just like those of their Whig competition. Thus, all Massachusetts newspapers--regardless of political leaning--printed heavy doses of Whig material.

The single exception to this was the Post-Boy in 1771, which ignored the celebration but printed two articles taking a Tory view of Bourgette's guilty plea in his perjury trial. These articles contended that the boy was forced to lie under threat from Whig mob leader William Molineux. The Boston Gazette answered the accusation with five sworn statements claiming Molineux only cautioned the boy to tell the truth.[19]

1771

The initial celebration in the series was the only one in which the displays and commemorative oration were widely separated in time. The displays were shown on the night of March 5 at Paul Revere's, but James Lovell did not orate until April 2. The Essex Gazette led off anniversary reporting by black-bordering all pages of its March 5 issue. The Halls gave the upper half of a horizontally divided page one "as a solemn and perpetual Memorial of the more reprinting among the Massachusetts newspapers than had previously occurred.

Dominance of Whig-biased material must have created a real problem for Tory printers. Their alternatives to printing Whig accounts were to ignore them or edit out the Whig flavor. Apparently they did neither, because their articles read just like those of their Whig competition. Thus, all Massachusetts newspapers--regardless of political leaning--printed heavy doses of Whig material.

The single exception to this was the *Post-Boy* in 1771, which ignored the celebration but printed two articles taking a Tory view of Bourgatte's guilty plea in his perjury trial. These articles contended that the boy was forced to lie under threat from Whig mob leader William Molineux. The *Boston Gazette* answered the accusation with five sworn statements claiming Molineux only cautioned the boy to tell the truth.[19]

1772

The initial celebration in the series was the only one in which the displays and commemorative oration were widely separated in time. The displays were shown on the night of March 5 at Paul Revere's, but James Lovell did not orate until April 2. The *Essex Gazette* led off anniversary reporting by black-bordering all pages of its March 5 issue. The Whigs gave the upper half of a horizontally divided page one "as a solemn and perpetual Memorial of the fatal and destructive Consequences of quartering Armies, in Time of Peace, in populous Cities." After five more references to this theme, the large-type proclamation dedicated the day as the "Anniversary of *Preston's* Massacre. . . ." The bottom half of the page contained a reprint from the *New Hampshire Gazette* of March 1, in which "Consideration" backed the "Several proposals offered to the Consideration of the Public, for commemorating the 5th of March on account of the Massacre."

On the next Tuesday, the *Gazette* originated another article by describing Salem's celebration. The Halls reported that "A numerous and crowded Assembly" attended "Dr. Whitaker's Meeting House" to hear him speak on "the fatal Effects" of the "Terror of Arms. . . ." Then on March 19, the *Gazette* reprinted the Boston plan for "perpetuating the Memory of the Horrid Massacre."[20]

On March 7 the *Massachusetts Spy* and the *Boston News-Letter* shared reporting of Boston's commemoration. The *News-Letter* account gave a detailed description of the day's activities and displays. The *Spy* similarly told of the displays, plus reporting a memorial oration by Dr. Thomas Young at "Factory-Hall." Also on page one, Thomas reprinted the *Essex Gazette*'s proclamation inside heavy black borders and topped by a skull and crossbones. The *Spy* did not report again, but Draper printed articles over the next three weeks. The *News-Letter* was first to report

Lovell's appointment to provide an oration commemorating the "barbarous Murder . . . and to impress upon our Minds the ruinous Tendency of Standing Armies in free Cities. . . ." Draper also "scooped" the Boston papers again on April 4 with a report of Lovell's speech.[21]

When the Boston Gazette came out on March 11, it contained nothing that had not already appeared in other papers, but its display emphasized the importance it attached to the anniversary. Edes and Gill black-bordered page one and divided it horizontally as had the Essex Gazette. In the upper half they reprinted that paper's proclamation exactly as it had appeared six days earlier. In the lower half of the page, under a current dateline, appeared the Massachusetts Spy's story about Boston's celebration. The Gazette reprinted the account in large type, spreading it across the full width of the page.

In the succeeding four weeks, the paper went again to the Essex Gazette--for the story of Salem's celebration--and twice to the News-Letter for accounts of Lovell's appointment and oration. For the first time in coverage of the Massacre, the Gazette followed rather than led the Boston press.[22]

In its coverage of the first anniversary, the Evening-Post, appearing on the same day as the Gazette, reprinted three of the same articles as its rival. But, as previously, the Post dispensed with graphic display. It

merely printed the articles in standard type within normal-width columns. Of the articles that appeared in the Boston Gazette, the Evening-Post deleted the proclamation on March 11.[23]

1772

With March 5 falling on Thursday in 1772, the Massachusetts Spy got the opportunity to lead in reporting the anniversary. Isaiah Thomas bordered page one in black, heading it with a skull and crossbones and a quote from Shakespeare about "Massacres." The Spy's lead story was a one-column proclamation memorializing the dead. A week later Thomas reprinted an account of the displays at Mrs. Clapham's and Warren's oration, which had appeared in both the Boston Gazette and Evening-Post of March 9. Then on April 16, the Spy printed one of two Tory articles about the commemorations to appear in the Massachusetts press. It was a parody on the celebrations and Thomas' earlier coverage entitled "Everymedon Ben Orpheous, The Pandemonium Gazette March 6 No. 2, 943, 789." The article told of "a great meeting at the sign of the Boot" with numerous toasts drunk in "praise of the heroic action" of the 5th of March, including one to the "gallant Preston . . . upon the happy prospect . . . of receiving further service from this doughty hero."[24]

On March 10 the Essex Gazette offered another proclamation. This one occupied all of the black-bordered

first page. The memorial, addressed "To The PUBLICK," commemorated "Preston's Massacre" resulting from "16 Months" of "*British Military Tyranny*." Liberal use of italics and large type provided additional emphasis. Inside, the Halls reprinted an account of the displays and orations from the Boston papers of the previous day.[25]

Four days after the anniversary celebration both the *Boston Gazette* and *Evening-Post* gave their readers an identical account of the displays and Joseph Warren's oration on the "dangerous Tendency of Standing Armies . . . in Commemoration of the horrid Massacre. . . ." This was the *Post*'s only article in 1772. The *Gazette*, however, reprinted "To The PUBLICK" from its Salem namesake two weeks later. Earlier, on February 17, Edes and Gill had announced Warren's selection as speaker for the occasion.[26]

Like the *Evening-Post*, the *News-Letter* printed only a single account describing the celebration of March 5. Draper's article of March 12 gave a more detailed description of Warren's oration delivered at "1230" in "Old South Meeting House" to a "vast Concourse of the Inhabitants of this and the neighboring towns, of both Sexes" than either the *Post* or *Gazette*. Three weeks earlier, the *News-Letter* had presented a Tory appeal for reason and calm in the celebration. Although "Civis" recognized that "The Continuance of Standing Armies in Populous Cities is indeed

productive of much Mischief" and approved of the orations and bell-tolling, he believed the displays improper and tending to "incite and arouse" the population unnecessarily "to the dishonor of the dead."[27]

1773

In 1773 all Massachusetts newspapers except the News-Letter printed only one account of the celebrations. Draper gave his readers two. The Boston Evening-Post and Gazette led in reporting the commemoration on March 8 with essentially the same story describing both the displays and Benjamin Church's speech. The two accounts differed only in describing the problems Church and John Hancock encountered in getting through the crowd. The Gazette told of them coming through a window, while the Post stated the "Orator reached the pulpit with Difficulty." On March 9 the Essex Gazette, reverting to previous practice, reprinted the Boston Gazette version, but the Massachusetts Spy used the Post as a source for its account of March 11. That day the News-Letter also reprinted the Evening-Post version. Earlier Draper had been the only printer to announce the town meeting for the purpose of engaging an orator "to perpetuate the Memory of the horrid Massacre . . . and to impress upon our Minds the ruinous Tendency of Standing Armies. . . ."[28]

In June, 1773, Sam Adams presented the "Hutchinson Letters" to the Massachusetts House of Representatives as

evidence of a plot against the colony. The House "Resolves," in condemning both the letters and their writers, stressed a conspiracy against liberty beginning with "certain Acts of the British Parliament for raising a revenue in America" which "might be carried into Effect by Military Force" introduced "into his Majesty's loyal Province, to intimidate the Minds of his Subjects. . . ." The "Resolves" further blamed Hutchinson, Oliver, and the customs officials as "the chief Instruments in the introduction of a Military Force . . . to carry their Plans into Execution." As the Whigs saw it, these men were "justly chargeable with the . . . Confusion, Misery and Bloodshed, which have been the Effects of the Introduction of Troops." The Massachusetts Spy and Boston News-Letter featured these "Resolves" on June 17, while the Boston Gazette and Evening-Post did likewise four days later.[29]

1774

With tensions increasing in Massachusetts following the Boston Tea Party in December, 1773, all seven newspapers in the Bay Colony reported some aspect of the Massacre anniversary of 1774. On January 31 the Boston Gazette announced that "The Honorable John Hancock, Esq; is appointed to deliver the ORATION, (in Commemoration of the horrid Massacre) on the 5th of March next." Edes and Gill printed this as a proclamation, using large type in a prominent display. The Evening Post also reported the

appointment, but in simpler form. In Salem, the Essex Gazette copied the Evening-Post version the next day, followed in Newburyport a day later by the Essex Journal.[30]

March 5th fell on Saturday in 1774 and the oration took place that day. Because of the Sabbath, however, the displays were postponed until Monday night, the 7th. The Boston Gazette, Evening-Post, and Post-Boy, which all published on Monday, reported the oration in similar fashion. As with the original accounts of the Massacre four years before, it appears that a Whig source provided a standard account to these papers. By way of introduction, the Post-Boy also printed a song denouncing the British soldiers. The Essex Gazette reprinted the account on March 8, the Essex Journal on March 9, and the News-Letter and Spy on March 10. Also in the March 9 issue of the Essex Journal, "A Son of Liberty" told about Newburyport's celebration. After recounting the bell-tolling and a sermon by Reverend Jonathan Parsons, "Son" discoursed on the army, referring to it as "the mercenary tool of despotism."[31]

A week after reporting Hancock's oration, the Post-Boy gave its readers an account of the Newburyport celebration different from that of the Essex Journal. In the same issue Mills and Hicks reported Boston's "solemn" observation of the "horrid Massacre," describing the "Portraits of the premeditated Murderers . . . exposed to

view at Mrs. Clapham's in King Street." A day later the Essex Gazette ended coverage of the 1774 anniversary by reprinting the Post-Boy's story of the Newburyport celebration.[32]

1775

By early 1775 the word battle between John Adams and Daniel Leonard was occupying much space in both the Boston Gazette and Post-Boy. The series gave Adams an opportunity to again comment on the conspiracy which resulted in the Massacre. "Novanglus" described the event that "has never been forgotten, nor the murderous minster and governors, who brought the troops here, forgiven, by any part of the continent, and never will be. . . ." "Massachusettensis" had no thoughts on armies for his readers, but told them the Whigs were using the anniversaries to "arouse the emotions." "Novanglus" ran in the Gazette through the anniversary date, sometimes filling an entire issue. This preoccupation with the series may account for the failure of Edes and Gill to print anything about the 1775 celebration.[33]

Coverage of Boston's commemoration that year was light in all papers. Besides the Boston Gazette, the Essex Gazette and Boston News-Letter ignored it, while the Evening-Post and Post-Boy merely printed one-sentence announcements that Warren would speak in Boston. On March 17, however, the Massachusetts Spy printed the full

text of Warren's address in which he railed at the dangers to liberty of a standing army. Mills and Hicks followed suit three days later. Strangely, the address appeared in the same issue of the Post-Boy as a "Massachusettensis" article. Thus, the strongest Tory voice in Massachusetts at the time was one of two newspapers to print the whole of a Massacre oration.[34]

Although the Essex Journal failed to report the anniversary celebrations in 1775, it did give its readers a final look at the threat of the army and reminded them of the impending event. On March 1, in an article telling of the landing of British troops in Marblehead, the Journal asked that "ye sons of Liberty" remember the Massacre "when our brethrens innocent blood was shed . . . by a murderous banditti, sent on the vile errand to reduce freeborn Sons of Liberty to abject Slavery. . . ." Then, on March 8--in one sentence--the Journal announced Oliver Noble's oration for that day.[35]

Connecticut

Noted similarities in the Massachusetts newspaper accounts of the Massacre celebrations make it impossible to identify the exact source from which papers in other colonies drew their articles. Therefore, discussion of diffusion during this period will be more general than in the previous two chapters.

Each of the Whig papers in Connecticut provided approximately the same amount of coverage of the commemorations. Both the Courant and Journal printed six articles over the four-year span, while the New-London Gazette published eight. The Connecticut papers had no favorite source in the Massachusetts press for their accounts. By reprinting stories from a variety of papers, they appeared to be taking from whichever source was first available. For its accounts, the Journal used the News-Letter in 1771 and 1772, either the Boston Gazette or Evening-Post in the latter year, the Evening-Post in 1773, either the News-Letter or the Massachusetts Spy in 1774, and either the Post-Boy or Evening-Post in 1775. The Courant went to the Essex Gazette in 1771, the Spy in 1772, Evening-Post in 1773, either the Spy again or the News-Letter in 1774, and the Essex Journal in 1775. Finally, the New-London Gazette reprinted from either the Boston Gazette or Evening-Post in 1771 and 1772, the Evening-Post and Massachusetts Spy in 1773, the Post-Boy in 1774, and either the Post-Boy or Evening-Post in 1775. In all but a single case, Connecticut papers ignored the proclamations printed in Massachusetts. The one exception was the Courant, which reprinted the 1772 memorial of the Massachusetts Spy.[36]

One locally written article referring to the Massacre also appeared in Connecticut during the anniversary period. On March 12, 1773, the New-London Gazette printed

a two-column essay by "A Connecticut Freeman" stressing the threat to liberty of standing armies. "Freeman" referred to the British troops "(the murderers of our British Brethren)" as coveting ground in the "garden of Eden."[37] By this limited coverage of the Massacre anniversaries, Connecticut readers were informed of the celebrations in Massachusetts and reminded again of the threat to liberty imposed by the British army.

New York

Articles about the Boston celebrations were scattered over the period in the New York press. The *New York Mercury* reprinted the 1771 account of the displays which had originally appeared in the *News-Letter*, while the *Journal* used either the *Boston Gazette* or *Evening-Post* article about the displays and oration in 1772. Again, in 1773, Holt went to one of these two sources for the "Resolves" to "Hutchinson's Letters." Two years passed before a New York newspaper again covered a Massacre anniversary celebration. On March 16, 1775, Rivington printed an extract of a letter from "A Spectator" in Boston received in "Wednesday's Post." The Tory writer mocked Warren's oration.[38]

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania newspapers followed the same general pattern as those in Connecticut in coverage of the

anniversaries, each taking articles from a variety of sources. The Chronicle did provide somewhat fuller coverage than the others, however. During the period 1771-1773, Goddard printed six articles, more than any other newspaper outside of Massachusetts over the same time frame. By contrast, the Gazette and Journal, printing through the entire period, offered three and four accounts, respectively, while the Packet printed four from 1772 on. The Evening-Post and Ledger each printed a single article in 1775.[39]

Again, as in Connecticut, only one Pennsylvania paper published a memorial proclamation. On March 30, 1772, Goddard reprinted "To the Public" from the Essex Gazette. He probably took this directly from the Salem paper of three weeks earlier, because less than a week had passed since it had appeared in the Boston Gazette--the only other paper to print it. And Pennsylvania was one of two colonies outside Massachusetts to read Warren's 1775 oration in a newspaper. The Evening-Post reprinted it on March 25. Towne could have got it either from the Massachusetts Spy of March 17 or Warren's pamphlet which went on sale in Boston the same day. It is unlikely that the Post-Boy provided the source, because only a little over four days had elapsed since the oration had appeared in that paper.[40]

Virginia

Of the three articles Virginia newspapers printed

about the anniversary celebrations, two appeared in 1771. Purdie and Dixon took them both from the Boston News-Letter. Nothing more appeared until 1775, when John Pinkney reprinted Warren's oration on April 13. It is impossible to tell his source for this article, because both Massachusetts papers that printed it (Spy and Post-Boy), Warren's pamphlet, and the Pennsylvania Evening-Post had sufficient time to reach Williamsburg.[41]

South Carolina

All anniversary coverage in South Carolina appeared in Charles Crouch's Country Journal. He reprinted one story in each of 1771, 1772, and 1773, adding two in 1774. In 1771 he published his article under a Boston dateline of March 12, which does not correspond to a printing date of any Boston paper. This was probably a typographical error on Crouch's part, because the article resembles those of the Boston Gazette and Evening-Post of March 11. He also used one of those two papers for his 1772 article, the News-Letter in 1773 and the Evening-Post and Post-Boy for his 1774 pieces.[42]

Conclusions

Over five years the newspapers provided Massachusetts with full coverage of the Boston Massacre story. To a lesser degree, people in Connecticut and Pennsylvania had access to information about the affair. In the South, about the anniversary celebrations, two appeared in 1771. Purdie and Dixon took them both from the Boston *Evening-Post*. Nothing more appeared until 1775, when John Pinkney reprinted Warren's oration on April 13. It is impossible to tell his source for this article, because both Massachusetts papers that printed it (*Spy* and *Gazette*), Warren's pamphlet, and the *Pennsylvania Evening Post* had sufficient time to reach Williamsburg.[41]

South Carolina

All anniversary coverage in South Carolina appeared in Charles Crouch's *Country Journal*. He reprinted one story in each of 1771, 1772, and 1773, adding two in 1774. In 1771 he published his article under a Boston dateline of March 12, which does not correspond to a printing date of any Boston paper. This was possibly a typographical error on Crouch's part, because the article resembles those of the *Boston Gazette* and *Evening-Post* of March 11. He also used one of those two papers for his 1773 article, the *News-Letter* in 1772 and the *Evening-Post* and *Gazette* for his 1774 pieces.[42]

Conclusions

Over five years the newspapers provided Massachusetts with full coverage of the Boston Massacre story. To a lesser degree, people in Connecticut and Pennsylvania had access to information about the affair. In the South, Virginia and South Carolina knew about the incident itself, but subsequent to the killings, newspapers in both colonies showed little interest in the continuing aspects of the Massacre. Such was the case in New York as well; but where the southern newspapers presented a substantially Whig view of the affair, those in New York avoided taking sides.

Of three basic themes exposed by Whig writers in the newspapers, one stood considerably above the others in importance. To the Whigs, the ultimate threat to liberty and the major lesson to be learned from the Massacre was that Great Britain possessed a means of enforcing "unlawful" laws in America--the army stationed "illegally" in her cities. This theme appeared strongly in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania, considerably less in South Carolina (though still there), somewhat in Virginia, but hardly at all in New York.

Newspapers showed strong public reaction in Massachusetts over five years. Following the shootings, towns throughout the province supported Boston, and that city, together with at least two other towns, conducted annual celebrations of the Massacre. And the great bulk of all articles appearing in the Massachusetts press was provided by local writers. Writers in Connecticut newspapers also showed an aroused public in that colony subsequent to the killings. But the newspapers do not report anniversary celebrations outside Massachusetts or any

public response to the various aspects of the Massacre--save a letter or two--south of Connecticut.

The preponderance of all articles about the Massacre diffused out of the Boston newspapers. Of the few stories that originated outside Massachusetts (London and New Hampshire) and diffused, all appeared under a Boston dateline. While this shows the importance of the Boston newspapers as a source of news, it does not mean that printers in other colonies clipped stories directly from a Boston source. Only in the case of the major articles appearing in the Boston press during the week following the Massacre, and a few others, has the study shown this to have been the practice. But the study did not eliminate possible intermediate reprinting for a majority of the articles. Thus, it would be inaccurate to claim that, over time, printers in other colonies clipped Boston stories directly from Boston newspapers.

Certain newspapers failed to live up to their partisan reputations in the way they covered the Massacre. Strong Whig papers like John Holt's _New York Journal_ and James Parker's _New York Post-Boy_ adopted a neutral, hands-off attitude. In Massachusetts, the _Boston News-Letter_, considered a Tory paper, printed far more Whig material than Tory. To a lesser extent, the _Boston Post-Boy_ also presented a Whig view when it supposedly favored the Tories. Other newspapers covered the story about as public response to the various aspects of the Massacre—save a letter or two—south of Connecticut.

The preponderance of all articles about the Massacre diffused out of the Boston newspapers. Of the few stories that originated outside Massachusetts (London and New Hampshire) and diffused, all appeared under a Boston dateline. While this shows the importance of the Boston newspapers as a source of news, it does not mean that printers in other colonies clipped stories directly from a Boston source. Only in the case of the major articles appearing in the Boston press during the week following the Massacre, and a few others, has the study shown this to have been the practice. But the study did not eliminate possible intermediate reprinting for a majority of the articles. Thus, it would be inaccurate to claim that, over time, printers in other colonies clipped Boston stories directly from Boston newspapers.

Certain newspapers failed to live up to their partisan reputations in the way they covered the Massacre. Strong Whig papers like John Holt's *New-York Journal* and James Parker's *New-York Gazette* adopted a neutral, hands-off attitude. In Massachusetts, the *Boston Chronicle*, considered a Tory paper, printed far more Whig material than Tory. To a lesser extent, the *Boston Post-Boy* also presented a Whig view when it supposedly favored the Tories. Other newspapers covered the story about as expected, although the Boston Evening-Post saved its neutral reputation only because it fought a Tory battle against the Boston Gazette following the trials. Its coverage of the killings and the anniversary celebrations was pro-Whig.

Of all newspapers, the Boston Gazette led in the amount of space devoted to the Massacre. It also originated most of the predominant Whig view of the affair. Additionally, the Gazette was reprinted more than any other Boston paper. It simply dominated the Massacre scene.

expected, although the Boston Evening-Post stood its neutral reputation only because it fought a Tory battle against the Boston Gazette following the trials. Its coverage of the killings and the anniversary declarations was pro-Whig.

Of all newspapers, the Boston Gazette led in the amount of space devoted to the massacre. It also originated most of the predominant Whig view of the affair. Additionally, the Gazette was reprinted more than any other Boston paper. It simply dominated the Massacre scene.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1] The Adams quote appears in Davidson, *Propaganda*, p. 196.

[2] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 30-31; Miller, *Sam Adams*, p. 189; Quincy, *Memoir*, p. 51, and *Dorr Papers*, IV, 397, identify Josiah Quincy as "Mentor"; EG, Feb. 12, 1771, p. 2; BG, Feb. 18, 1771, p. 2; BEP, Feb. 18, 1771, p. 2.

[3] EG, Mar. 19, 1771, p. 3; BNL, Mar. 7, 1771, p. 3, Mar. 21, p. 3, Apr. 4, p. 2, Mar. 12, 1772, p. 2; BG, Mar. 11, 1771, p. 1. Content of these orations is discussed in Chapter V.

[4] Anne R. Cunningham (ed.), *Letters and Diary of John Rowe* (Boston: W. B. Clarke Company, 1903), p. 225; BNL, Mar. 12, 1772, p. 3; BG, Mar. 8, 1773, p. 4.

[5] EG, Mar. 12, 1771, p. 3; EJ, Mar. 9, 1774, p. 3, Mar. 8, 1775, p. 3.

[6] BPB, Mar. 11, 1771, p. 3, Mar. 25, p. 3; BG, Mar. 18, 1771, p. 2.

[7] Catherine D. Bowen, *John Adams and the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company and Atlantic Monthly Press, 1950), pp. 430-32; Sam Adams letter to Arthur Lee, June 14, 1773, in Cushing (ed.), *Adams Writings*, III, pp. 40-41; Jensen, *Founding*, p. 420.

[8] BG, Feb. 6, 1775, p. 1; BPB, Feb. 27, 1775, p. 2; Butterfield (ed.), *Adams Diary*, II, p. 161, note 1, III, p. 313, and Adams, *Adams Works*, IV, pp. 5-10, identify Adams as "Novanglus" and Leonard as "Massachusettensis." Adams originally thought Jonathan Sewall was his antagonist, but later became convinced it was Leonard. *Dorr Papers*, IV, pp. 662 and 688, says it was Sewall. The later works prove him incorrect.

[9] BNL, Mar. 21, 1771, p. 3, Feb. 20, 1772, p. 3, Apr. 4, 1771, p. 2; MS, Mar. 17, 1775, pp. 1-2; BPB, Mar. 20, 1775, pp. 1-2 of Supplement.

[10] Detailed references for these generalizations will be cited in discussions of individual newspapers.

[11] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 188; Thomas, History, I, pp. 175-76; Brigham, Bibliography, I, p. 335.

[12] EJ, Dec. 4, 1773, p. 1; Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 174; Thomas, History, I, pp. 179-80; Brigham, Bibliography, I, p. 373. Among those Whigs was Reverend Jonathan Parsons, who preached an anniversary sermon in Newburyport in 1774.

[13] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 188; Brigham, Bibliography, I, p. 328.

[14] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 188, 236; Brigham, Bibliography, I, p. 397.

[15] Davidson, Propaganda, p. 221; Thomas, History, I, pp. 192-93, II, pp. 91-92; Brigham, Bibliography, I, pp. 53, 67. Notes will continue to identify the Gazette as NLG following change in name.

[16] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 285; Thomas, History, II, pp. 305-08, 313; Brigham, Bibliography, I, pp. 532, 636, 686; Pomerantz, "Patriot Newspapers," p. 316.

[17] Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 165; Davidson, Propaganda, pp. 231, 398; Brigham, Bibliography, II, pp. 929, 940, 942, 931. For the latest discussion of Pennsylvania newspapers during the war see Dwight L. Teeter, "A Legacy of Expression: Philadelphia Newspapers and Congress during the War for Independence" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1966).

[18] Schlesinger, Prelude, pp. 186, 214, 239; Brigham, Bibliography, II, pp. 1129, 1159, 1161-62.

[19] BPB, Mar. 11, 1771, p. 3, Mar. 25, p. 3; BG, Mar. 18, 1771, p. 2.

[20] EG, Mar. 5, 1771, p. 1, Mar. 12, p. 3, Mar. 19, p. 3.

[21] BNL, Mar. 7, 1771, p. 3, Mar. 14, p. 3, Mar. 21, p. 3, Apr. 4, p. 1; MS, Mar. 7, 1771, p. 1.

[22] BG, Mar. 11, 1771, p. 1, Mar. 18, p. 2, Mar. 25, p. 1, Apr. 1, p. 3, Apr. 8, p. 2.

[23] BEP, Mar. 11, 1771, p. 2, Mar. 18, p. 3, Apr. 8, p. 1.

[24] MS, Mar. 5, 1772, p. 1, Mar. 12, p. 3, Apr. 16, p. 1.

[25] EG, Mar. 10, 1772, p. 1.

[26] BG, Feb. 17, 1772, p. 3, Mar. 9, p. 1, Mar. 23, p. 2; BEP, Mar. 9, 1772, p. 3.

[27] BNL, Feb. 20, 1772, p. 3, Mar. 12, p. 3.

[28] BG, Mar. 8, 1773, p. 4; BEP, Mar. 8, 1773, p. 1; MS, Mar. 11, 1773, p. 2; EG, Mar. 9, 1773, p. 3; BNL, Mar. 4, 1773, p. 3, Mar. 11, p. 3.

[29] BNL, June 17, 1773, p. 3; MS, June 17, 1773, p. 1; BG, June 21, 1773, p. 1; BEP, June 21, 1773, p. 2.

[30] BG, Jan. 31, 1774, p. 2; BEP, Jan. 31, 1774, p. 3; EG, Feb. 1, 1774, p. 3; EJ, Feb. 2, 1774, p. 3.

[31] BG, Mar. 7, 1774, p. 2; BEP, Mar. 7, 1774, p. 2; BPB, Mar. 7, 1774, p. 2; EG, Mar. 8, 1774, p. 3; EJ, Mar. 9, 1774, p. 3; BNL, Mar. 10, 1774, p. 3.

[32] BPB, Mar. 14, 1774, p. 3; EG, Mar. 15, 1774, p. 3.

[33] BG, Feb. 6, 1775, p. 1; BPB, Feb. 27, 1775, p. 2. "Massachusettensis" was later compiled into a pamphlet which will be discussed in Chapter V.

[34] BEP, Mar. 6, 1775, p. 3; BPB, Mar. 6, 1775, p. 3; MS, Mar. 17, 1775, p. 1; BPB, Mar. 20, 1775, pp. 1-2 of Supplement.

[35] EJ, Mar. 1, 1775, p. 3, Mar. 8, p. 3.

[36] CJ, Mar. 15, 1771, pp. 2-3, Feb. 28, 1772, p. 4, Mar. 20, pp. 2-3, Mar. 19, 1773, p. 2, Mar. 25, 1774, p. 2, Mar. 8, 1775, p. 1; CC, Mar. 26, 1771, p. 3, Mar. 17, 1772, p. 3, Mar. 16, 1773, p. 2, Feb. 8, 1774, p. 2, Mar. 22, p. 2, Mar. 13, 1775, p. 1; NLG, Mar. 22, 1771, p. 1, Mar. 13, 1772, p. 3, Mar. 19, 1773, p. 3, June 25, p. 2, Mar. 18, 1774, p. 2, Mar. 10, 1775, p. 2.

[37] NLG, Mar. 12, 1773, p. 2.

[38] NYM, Mar. 18, 1771, p. 2; NYJ, Mar. 26, 1772, p. 2, July 1, 1773, pp. 1-2; RG, Mar. 16, 1775, p. 3.

[39] PJ, Mar. 26, 1772, p. 2, Mar. 24, 1773, p. 3, June 30, 1773, p. 1, Mar. 16, 1774, p. 3; PC, Mar. 18, 1771, p. 2, Apr. 1, p. 2, Mar. 9, 1772, p. 3, Mar. 15, 1774, p. 4, Mar. 22, 1773, p. 3, June 28, p. 2; PG, Mar. 21, 1771, p. 2, Mar. 12, 1772, p. 2, June 30, 1773, p. 1; PL, Mar. 8, 1775, p. 2; PP, Mar. 9, 1772, p. 2, July 12, 1773, pp. 2-3, Feb. 14, 1774, p. 3, Mar. 13, 1775, p. 3.

[40] PEP, Mar. 25, 1775, pp. 1-4; PC, Mar. 30, 1772, p. 2; BNL, Mar. 17, 1775, p. 3, has ad for Warren's pamphlet.

[41] VG(PD), Apr. 4, 1771, p. 2, Apr. 11, p. 2; VG(R), Apr. 13, 1775, pp. 1-2.

[42] SCCJ, Apr. 19, 1771, p. 2, May 19, 1772, p. 2, Apr. 13, 1773, p. 2, Mar. 15, 1774, p. 1, Apr. 19, p. 2.

[39] NJ, Mar. 28, 1773, p. 2, Nov. 24, 1773, p. 3, June 30, 1773, p. 1, Mar. 16, 1774, p. 3; NC, Mar. 18, 1771, p. 2, Apr. 1, p. 2, Mar. 9, 1772, p. 1, Mar. 15, 1774, p. 4, Mar. 22, 1773, p. 3, June 28, p. 2; PG, Mar. 21, 1771, p. 2, Mar. 12, 1772, p. 2, June 30, 1773, p. 1; PL, Mar. 6, 1775, p. 2; PP, Mar. 9, 1772, p. 2, July 12, 1773, pp. 2-3, Feb. 14, 1774, p. 3, Mar. 13, 1775, p. 2.

[40] NYP, Mar. 25, 1775, pp. 1-4; PG, Mar. 30, 1772, p. 2; NCL, Mar. 17, 1775, p. 3, has ad for Warren's pamphlet.

[41] VG(PD), Apr. 4, 1771, p. 2, Apr. 11, p. 2; VG(R), Apr. 13, 1775, pp. 2-3.

[42] NCGS, Apr. 19, 1771, p. 2, May 10, 1772, p. 2, Apr. 13, 1773, p. 2, Mar. 15, 1774, p. 1, Apr. 19, p. 2.

CHAPTER V

PAMPHLETS, SERMONS, AND COMMITTEES OF CORRESPONDENCE TELL ABOUT THE MASSACRE: 1770-1775

> Standing armies in general, in a time of peace have been judged extremely dangerous to a free state. And when they have been quartered among the people, on whom they had no dependence for their support, the consequences in many instances, have been intolerable.
>
> --John Lathrop, Artillery Sermon, 1774

This chapter seeks to describe and compare the parts played by sermons, pamphlets, and committees of correspondence in providing information and airing opposing views about the Boston Massacre throughout the colonies. As such it focuses upon the dual function that pamphlets performed as a means of communication. In some cases persons simply wrote their ideas and argument as pamphlets, but more often (in the case of the Massacre) pamphlets provided a convenient vehicle for wider dissemination of views which appeared first in some other form.

Thirty pamphlets (Appendix B) referring to the Boston Massacre appeared in America between the time of the incident and the outbreak of open warfare with Great Britain. Fewer than one-third originated in that form,

however. Over half originated as oral presentations--sermons and orations--while the remaining twenty per cent began as either a letter, newspaper article, or legislative or town meeting proceeding. (Table 4)

TABLE 4

TYPE-REFERENCE TO BOSTON MASSACRE IN PAMPHLETS BY ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS FORM

Form	Direct Reference	Oblique Reference
Pamphlet	6	3
Sermon	5	4
Oration	6	
Letter		1
Newspapers	1	1
Proceedings	2	1

Two-thirds of the pamphlets were occasioned by the shootings, trials or anniversaries, or discussed the affair in some detail with positive identification of it. The remainder alluded to the Massacre through use of symbols associated with the killings in discussion of the threat to liberty posed by a standing army; called "oblique references" herein. An example is that from <u>A Brief Review Of The Rise And Progress, Services and Sufferings of New England . . .</u> , in which the author inquired if it was in the interest of Great Britain to maintain troops in New England during time of peace when this practice "results in however. Over half originated as oral presentations—sermons and orations—while the remaining twenty per cent began as either a letter, newspaper article, or legislative or town meeting proceeding. (Table 4)

TABLE 4

TYPE-REFERENCE TO BOSTON MASSACRE IN PAMPHLETS
BY ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS FORM

Form	Direct Reference	Oblique Reference
Pamphlet	6	3
Sermon	5	4
Oration	6	
Letter		1
Newspapers	1	1
Proceedings	2	1

Two-thirds of the pamphlets were occasioned by the shootings, trials or anniversaries, or discussed the affair in some detail with positive identification of it. The remainder alluded to the Massacre through use of symbols associated with the killings in discussion of the threat to liberty posed by a standing army; called "oblique references" herein. An example is that from A Brief Review of The Rise and Progress, Services and Sufferings of New England . . . , in which the author inquired if it was in the interest of Great Britain to maintain troops in New England during time of peace when this practice "results in affronting, and even murthering /sic/ some of the Inhabitants . . . while appropriating Castle William with its artillery. . . ."[1]

Distribution and Diffusion

Whatever its original source, the political pamphlet played a substantial role only in Massachusetts in communicating word about the Massacre. Eighty per cent of the pamphlets originated in the Bay Colony, but of these, evidence of circulation outside Massachusetts is available for only five. The five included the record of trial, imported in its original Boston edition into South Carolina in 1771 by Robert Wells; John Allen's An Oration Upon the Beauties of Liberty . . . , reprinted in Connecticut in 1773; Pennsylvania and Connecticut reprints of John Hancock's 1774 commemorative oration; Observations On The . . . Boston Port-Bill . . . , by Josiah Quincy, also reprinted in Pennsylvania in the same year; and a 1775 New York reprint of Joseph Warren's commemorative speech of that year. Wells' advertisement in his South Carolina American General Gazette for the Boston printing of trial record marks the single instance of importation of a Massacre pamphlet into another colony in its original form. All others which diffused were reprinted for sale.[2]

Six Massacre pamphlets were originally printed in colonies other than Massachusetts. Stephen Johnson's

Integrity and Piety the best Principles of a Good Administration . . . and the anonymously written Brief Review of the Rise and Progress, Services and Sufferings, of New England . . . appeared in Connecticut in 1770 and 1774, respectively. Peter Timothy printed William Henry Drayton's letter to the continental congress as a pamphlet in South Carolina in 1774, and Joseph Crukshank did likewise in Philadelphia that year for Arthur Lee's pamphlet A True State Of The Proceedings . . . In . . . Massachusetts Bay. Two pamphlets appeared in New York in 1775 as James Rivington collected all of Daniel Leonard's "Massachusettensis" articles into The Origin of the American Contest . . . , and John Holt printed No Standing Army In the British Colonies. . . . Of these, American Contest was the only one to be reprinted elsewhere, appearing also in Boston.[3]

To aid the reader in better visualizing the limited distribution of Massacre pamphlets, Tables 5 and 6 have been prepared. They show that the thirty pamphlets had thirty-seven identifiable points of distribution throughout the six colonies. Some, that is, were reprinted at a second or third location, and one was imported in bulk for resale by a retailer-printer.

From these it may be seen that only one pamphlet making direct reference to the Massacre appeared for sale outside Massachusetts before 1774. (Table 5) And merely a

single pamphlet referring obliquely to the affair showed beyond that colony in the first three years following the incident. (Table 6)

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF BOSTON MASSACRE PAMPHLETS:
YEAR BY COLONY--DIRECT REFERENCE*

Year	Mass.	Conn.	N. Y.	Pa.	Va.	S. C.
1770	6					
1771	2					1
1772	2					
1773	2					
1774	3	1		2		
1775	4		2			

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF BOSTON MASSACRE PAMPHLETS:
YEAR BY COLONY--OBLIQUE REFERENCE*

Year	Mass.	Conn.	N. Y.	Pa.	Va.	S. C.
1770	1	1				
1771						
1772						
1773	3	1				
1774	1	1		2		
1775	1		1			

*Tables 5 and 6 show number of single appearances of all pamphlets within each colony.

The two-year period of relative quiet experienced by the colonies in their relationship with Great Britain following repeal of the Revenue Act is reflected not just in a reduction in the numbers of Massacre pamphlets which appeared, but also by a substantial abatement in general political pamphleteering. In 1771, four general political pamphlets were printed--two of them reprints of earlier ones--while three appeared in 1772. Of the seven, four referred to the Massacre, but only one diffused beyond Massachusetts. (Tables 5 and 6, Appendix B)

Beginning in 1773 and continuing through 1775, political pamphleteering increased as tension grew between America and England. Among the nearly 100 pamphlets printed in the colonies during this period--not counting multiple printings and editions--appear eighteen of those referring to the Boston Massacre. (Appendix B) With the exception of one, all pamphlets referring obliquely to the affair are included in this group. Moreover, the period 1773-1775 saw Massacre pamphlets appear in colonies other than Massachusetts.

But the overall record of distribution and diffusion outside the Bay Colony is not impressive. For the full period 1770-1775, approximately sixty-eight per cent of single-pamphlet appearances occurred in Massachusetts, leaving slightly less than one-third spread over the other five colonies, with but two showing south of

Pennsylvania. (Tables 5 and 6)

Sermons and the Clergy

Sermons played an important role in spreading word of the various aspects of the Massacre story throughout Massachusetts but, so far as pamphlets tell the story, did little in other colonies. With the shootings fresh in the minds of the people of Boston, the clergy picked up the story. On Thursday, March 8, 1770, John Lathrop preached about it at a lecture in the city. He repeated the sermon in Boston's Second Church that Sunday and again in Charlestown, a week later. Innocent Blood . . . . was first printed as a pamphlet in London later in the year, and made its way back to Boston where Edes and Gill printed it in the spring of 1771 because of "solicitations" upon Lathrop by persons who felt it germane to the political situation existing there.[5]

May of 1770 saw the Massacre addressed in the pulpit three times. On the 10th, in Hartford, Connecticut, Stephen Johnson referred obliquely to it in an election sermon preached before the general assembly of that colony. This is the single instance revealed in the public communications media of a sermon referring to the Boston Massacre being preached in a colony other than Massachusetts. Timothy Green put it into pamphlet form in New London. Then, on May 30, Charles Chauncey, pastor of Boston's First

Church, addressed the subject directly in a sermon later printed by Daniel Kneeland and Thomas Leverett. On the same day Samuel Cooke mentioned the Massacre obliquely as he preached in Cambridge before an audience including Lieutenant-Governor Thomas Hutchinson. This sermon also got into print.[6]

Massachusetts ministers are known to have orated at three Massacre anniversary celebrations in 1771 and 1772. In 1771 John Lathrop preached an anniversary sermon at the "Old North Meeting House" in Boston to a "large crowd" on Sunday following the 5th of March. Lathrop has been described by one historian as an ardent patriot who shared in all revolutionary activities dating from his installation as pastor at the Old North Church in 1768. Reverend Whitaker also preached in 1771 to "A numerous and crowded Assembly" at his "Meeting House" in Salem on the occasion of that town's anniversary celebration. Then in 1772, Charles Chauncey preceded Joseph Warren's Massacre oration in Boston's "Old South" with a sermon on the subject. Chauncey was another pro-Whig clergyman and has been described as an "ardent and influential" friend of both John and Samuel Adams. No copy of these three sermons was found in any reference consulted by this writer. It is presumed that they were not printed after delivery.[7]

In 1773, two ministers mentioned the Massacre in sermons which were printed as pamphlets. John Allen, an

itinerant Baptist preacher who spent time in both Boston and New York between 1770 and 1773, referred to it obliquely in early January at the Second Baptist church in Boston. An Oration Upon the Beauties of Liberty . . . was subsequently published in three editions in Boston and one in Salem, then reprinted twice in Connecticut, thus making it the only Massachusetts Massacre sermon to diffuse in print outside the Bay Colony. In April, Allen also wrote the pamphlet An American Alarm . . . in which he referred directly to the killings. No evidence exists that he first offered this as a sermon, and the pamphlet appeared only in Massachusetts. Finally, Reverend Howard Simeon made another oblique reference to the Massacre in A Sermon Preached To The Ancient and Honorable Artillery-Company, In Boston . . . June 7th, 1773.[8]

The years 1774 and 1775 saw the clergy again speaking at anniversary celebrations, while the annual election of officers of Boston's militia artillery company also inspired reference to the affair. Jonathan Parsons delivered the oration at Newburyport's commemoration in 1774, and Oliver Noble did likewise the following year. John Lathrop made his third direct reference to the Massacre on June 6, 1775, in his "Artillery Sermon." Each of these was reprinted as a pamphlet in Massachusetts.[9]

By their participation in Massacre commemorations and other continued references to the affair over the

five-year period, the pro-Whig clergy demonstrated their political activism. But their sermons and pamphlets--with but two exceptions in Connecticut--were limited to Massachusetts. In the Bay Colony, Tories believed the clergy's efforts had considerable effect upon public opinion regarding the Massacre. Chief Justice of the Superior Court Peter Oliver thought their endeavors both prior to and following the Massacre trials caused the people to believe in the soldiers' guilt, while Hutchinson felt the sermons led the citizens to feel they could as lawfully resist the British troops as those of a foreign power.[10]

Committees of Correspondence

Committees of correspondence paid scant attention to the Massacre in their public communications. They were involved in only two of the pamphlets which mentioned the killings. One appeared in late 1772 and the other in mid-1773.

Boston appointed its 21-member committee on October 28, 1772, at a Whig-dominated town meeting. Included were such illustrious names as James Otis, Samuel Adams, Joseph Warren, Benjamin Church, Josiah Quincy, Thomas Young, and William Molineux. The committee's first effort at uniting Massachusetts behind the Whig cause was a report stating the "rights of the colonists and of

Massachusetts" and listing grievances and violations of those rights. Among the listing was the Boston Massacre. This statement, written largely by Sam Adams, was printed under authority of the town meeting as the Votes and Proceedings . . . Of The Town of Boston . . . . It circulated under a cover letter to correspondents throughout Massachusetts, but there is no evidence that it was reprinted outside the colony.[11]

Then, in June, 1773, the Boston committee spread "Hutchinson's Letters" accompanied by the "Resolves" of the Massachusetts assembly through the Bay Colony as a pamphlet. As we have earlier seen, the press in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia carried the "Letters" and "Resolves" at the same time. The newspaper and pamphlet versions differed in display, however, and the articles in the New York and Pennsylvania newspapers came from the Boston press, not the pamphlet. The pamphlet, therefore, does not show in the distribution figures in Table 6 for either New York or Pennsylvania. Regardless of form, historians credit the committee with circulating the "Letters" and "Resolves," thus they represent the single instance in which a committee of correspondence disseminated word of the Massacre outside Massachusetts.[12]

Whig Themes and Tory Rebuttal

A reader of a political pamphlet or a listener at a New England sermon or oration between 1770 and 1775 would

have learned one principal thing about the Boston Massacre: that it was the consequence of a standing army whose task was not to provide protection to the people, but to terrify them into compliance with unjust laws, laws which would destroy their liberty by making civil authority subordinate to military. Secondarily, he (or she) was also told that (1) the affair grew out of a larger plot between soldiers and customs commissioners; (2) the soldiers were to blame, killing innocent people for no reason; and (3) the remedy for the situation was the removal of the army, substituting a people's militia when protection was needed.

Because of the repeated assertion of the main theme in all the pamphlets, each will not be mentioned in the following discussion. Rather, examples illustrating the themes have been selected. For the reader who may wish to pursue the matter further, the list in Appendix B should serve as a useful guide.

The initial pamphlet effort was _A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston . . . ._ Like the original newspaper article appearing in the _Boston Gazette_ following the shootings, this pamphlet set the tone for all which later came out of the Whig camp. It was written by a committee consisting of James Bowdoin, Joseph Warren, and Samuel Pemberton on order of the Boston town meeting from depositions taken from among townspeople who witnessed the shootings. The pamphlat was designed to fix blame for the

incident on the British troops in the minds of those in Great Britain. Ninety-four of ninety-six depositions were biased against the soldiers. Official distribution was restricted to England so as not to prejudice the jury which would try the soldiers in Boston. When London printings began appearing in America, however, Edes and Gill (who had prepared the original copies for English consumption) put out facsimilies of London editions. In all, it was printed four times in Boston within four months, but never reprinted in any other American colony.[13]

The pamphlet traced the Massacre as a direct result of conflict between the town and the customs commissioners resulting in a gradual breakdown in relations between the two, convincing the commissioners that they required protection of British troops. The Whig writers stated their case against stationing troops in the town, saying it was "contrary to the Magna Carta, contrary to the very letter of the bill of rights, in which it is declared, that raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace . . . is against the law . . . in direct violation of an act of Parliament for quartering troops in America." Then, the pamphlet stressed the misconduct of the troops in relation to the town's inhabitants, the consequences of which was the "outrage and Massacre as happened on the evening of fifth instant." It continued blaming the soldiers for firing under orders of their

officer-in-charge, Captain Preston, as part of a premeditated plan to murder the townspeople that night.[14]

A Short Narrative began a pamphlet duel between Whigs and Tories. In response the latter produced their own version of the affair in A Fair Account Of The Late Unhappy Disturbance At Boston . . . , which contained 125 depositions taken from other witnesses in the town. It stressed culpability of the town in creating a threat to the soldiers as part of a preconceived plan by radical elements to remove both the troops and customs officials. Although never printed in America, the Boston News-Letter reported in September, 1770, that the pamphlet was circulating in the city. And we have earlier seen examples of newspaper articles which derived from it. Whigs countered this Tory response with Additional Observations To A Short Narrative . . . , which, though printed separately, appeared as an appendix to some London editions of A Short Narrative.[15]

The three sermons preached in 1770 offer good examples of the pamphlet themes. In Innocent Blood, John Lathrop emphasized the threat of standing armies, saying the Massacre should convince the world of the dangers of stationing troops in a city under pretense of assisting and strengthening the government. He also said that soldiers quartered among the citizens would abuse them, because soldiers and civilians were incompatible living together.

He asked for vengeance against those "determined to murder the inhabitants" who were dispersing when fired upon. Citing the Bible, he demanded "blood for blood."[16]

In asking for impartiality of the courts, Charles Chauncey implied that since the arrival of troops the courts had been "suspect" in their adjudication of cases involving soldiers and civilians. But, with the impending trial of the soldiers, they had the opportunity to let "justice and judgment run down the streets as a dream." He went on, hoping the trials would identify those guilty of the "slaughter and wounding of innocents," asking death for those "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." On the same day Samuel Cooke cited the threat to liberty imposed by standing armies in time of peace. In that context he asked, "When a people are in subjection to those . . . armed with the terrors of death, under the most absolute command, ready and obliged to execute the most daring orders--what has been the consequence?"[17]

Over five years the commemorative orations--each reproduced as a pamphlet--contained the most detailed references to the Massacre, and best illustrate the themes of all pamphlets. In 1771 Lovell devoted half his oration to the threat and consequences of standing armies. He gave legal status to his argument by citing an article in the English bill of rights prohibiting "raising or keeping" a standing army during time of peace. He was also the first

to offer an alternative to a professional army, saying "by brave militias" a nation will "rise to grandeur; and they will come to ruin by a mercenary army."[18]

Joseph Warren, in 1772, said the Massacre was the consequence of the introduction of a standing army "for obedience to acts which upon fair examination, appeared to be unjust and unconstitutional." He continued in an emotional indictment of the crimes of the army:

> Language is too feeble to paint the emotion of our souls, when our streets are stained with blood of our brethren--when our ears are wounded by the groans of the dying, and our eyes are tormented with the sight of the mangled bodies of the dead . . . our houses wrapt in flames, our children subjected to the barbarous caprice of the raging soldiery,--our beauteous virgins exposed to all the insolence of unbridled passion . . . .[19]

In 1773, Dr. Benjamin Church, a leader of the Boston Tea Party, future member of the Provincial Congress and future surgeon-general of the Continental Army, evoked visions of "brutal ruffians" crushing "unsuspecting victims . . . defenseless, prostrate, bleeding countrymen . . . ." He called for those who survived to "fire the zealous into manly rage, against the foul oppression of quartering troops in populous cities in time of peace."[20]

Hancock, in 1774, eulogized the dead with passionate rhetoric, describing the scene "when Satan with his chosen band opened the sluices of New-England's blood, and sacreligiously polluted our land with the dead bodies of her guiltless sons." To him, they represented the epitome

of tyranny imposed upon the colonies from without. Like Lovell, Hancock's alternative to a standing army was "a well-disciplined militia" as "security against foreign foes."[21]

In 1775, Warren, making his second appearance as a commemorative orator, articulated Boston's increasing fear of standing armies with references to the past:

> But when the people on the one part, considered the army as sent to enslave them, and the army on the other, were taught to look on the people as in a state of rebellion, it was but just to fear the most disagreeable consequences. Our fears, we have seen, were but too well grounded.

But Warren also believed that the coming of British troops provided the colonial militia with an opportunity to improve themselves, because "the exactness and beauty of their discipline inspire our youth with ardor in the pursuit of military knowledge."[22]

In pamphlets making oblique reference to the Massacre, secondary themes do not appear. A typical pamphlet discoursed on the faults of Great Britain in her relationship with America. Argument ran from natural rights philosophy to Parliament's lack of legislative authority over the colonies to the tyranny of standing armies. When addressing this latter subject, the pamphlet referred to the consequences therein--symbols associated with the Boston Massacre. A few examples should be sufficient to illustrate these references.[23]

Simeon Howard devoted the bulk of his 1773 artillery sermon to a warning of the need to be prepared to defend liberty by military force. In the sermon he defined the standing army as "a number of men paid by the public, to devote themselves wholly to the military profession, while the body of the people followed their peaceable employments without paying any attention to the art of war." This, he said, was dangerous because the army was "generally composed of men who have no real estate in the dominion," whose "manner of life tends to corrupt their morals," causing them to "abuse the unarmed and defenseless people." He concluded that the colonies would never agree to a standing army among them in time of peace. "Virtue, domestic peace . . . and even the once *crimsoned stones of the street*, all loudly *cry out* against the measure."[24]

In his 1774 pamphlet directed at the closing of Boston's port by the Boston Port Bill, Josiah Quincy also attacked the standing army as a threat to freedom. "Whenever, therefore, the *profession of arms* becomes a *distinct order* in the state, and a *standing army part of the constitution* . . . *the social compact is defeated*. . . ." Quincy went on to list examples throughout history of the negative results of military might in society. He ended saying New England was early warned of the dangers by "the permission [sic] of an early carnage in our streets" when the people were awakened to the danger of "being *politely*

beguiled into security and fraudfully drawn into bondage: --a state that sooner or later ends in rapine and blood."[25]

Also in 1774, South Carolina Whig William Henry Drayton's letter to the continental congress in Philadelphia listed eight consequences of British troops being quartered among a "free population." Included was this: "Frequent robberies, Assaults, Batteries, Burglaries, Rapes, Rapines, Murders, barbarous Cruelties and other most abominable Vices and Outrages . . . few of which . . . have been questioned, and fewer punished."[26]

Then in 1775, an anonymous pamphleteer in New York devoted his entire effort to dangers of a standing army to that colony. In referring to a lack of choice afforded the soldier in dealing with civilians because of the "will" of his "tyrannical masters," he concluded that "murders" were the result.[27]

Of the thirty Boston Massacre pamphlets, twenty-five put forth the Whig view, leaving five to rebut the polemics of those writers. Of these, one was A Fair Account, London editions of which circulated to some extent in Boston. Another was the record of the Massacre trials, printed in Boston in 1770 and imported into South Carolina the next year. While testimony showed the Whig side, the defense and verdicts substantiated Tory opinion of the affair.

Of the others, one was a short (nine pages) satire

on the Massacre orations delivered at Boston's British Coffee House in 1775 by Dr. Thomas Bolton. It attacked Whig leaders in Boston as traitors to the Crown, but appeared in only one Boston printing. That same year, the Selectmen of Boston printed a series of letters by deposed Boston Tory printer, John Mein. Mein wrote the letters in a London newspaper the previous year, accusing "Doctor /Benjamin/ Franklin's Faction" in Boston of exciting "the soldiers to some form of outrage to ground a pretense for their removal." To Mein, the Massacre resulted from an attack on the soldiers, causing them to fire in self-defense out of fear for their lives. Thus, his argument followed the standard Tory position regarding the affair. Again, this pamphlet was printed only once--in Boston. Also in 1775, Daniel Leonard used the Massacre commemorations to illustrate advantages enjoyed by the Whigs in the rhetorical contest with the Tories. He cited the use of orations, "effigies, paintings and other forms of imagery" in the celebrations as a means "designed to arouse emotions." Printed in New York, it was one of two Tory pamphlets to appear outside Massachusetts.[28]

Conclusions

Pamphlets, sermons, and committees of correspondence did little to spread word about the Boston Massacre beyond Massachusetts. Only one-third of those mentioning the affair appeared outside the Bay Colony. The South was

particularly devoid of pamphlet references to the Massacre, as Virginia received none and South Carolina but two. The clergy was responsible for just two references to the affair outside Massachusetts--both in Connecticut--while committees of correspondence cited it only once in New York and Pennsylvania.

Eighty per cent of the pamphlets circulated in Massachusetts, however--many in multiple editions or printings--thus adding considerably to the volume of rhetoric that colony received about the Massacre. The clergy participated actively in the Bay Colony, speaking out following the killings and participating in anniversary commemorations over the years. Committees of correspondence, on the other hand, mentioned the affair only twice in five years.

Pamphlets referring to the Massacre were not designed to inform. Instead, their purpose was to argue a point of view--to persuade people that their liberty was threatened by a standing army placed in their midst by Great Britain not to protect but to tyrannize them. They heard and read this Whig assessment of the situation for five years, whereas the Tory effort to counter the argument was minimal by comparison. The threat diminished in Boston with the removal of the troops following the Massacre, and so did pamphlet references to the affair. But the danger reappeared in 1774 with the introduction of British

soldiers as part of the Intolerable Acts. Concurrently, pamphleteering on the subject flourished, and writers used the Massacre as a prime example to illustrate and underscore the threat. Thus, the danger of the standing army was the theme to which the Massacre was related.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

Pamphlet titles cited here have been shortened for ease in reading the notes. Fuller titles are contained in Appendix B and the Bibliography.

[1] *A Brief Review Of The Rise And Progress, Services, and Sufferings of New England . . .* (Norwich, Conn., 1774), pp. 14-16. Also see Appendix A for details of method by which pamphlets were located.

[2] SCAG, Mar. 12, 1771, p. 1; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 69-70, 89, 101, 148-49.

[3] Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 62, 80, 86, 94, 134-35, 137.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 65-68.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 62; BG, Oct. 1, 1770, p. 2; John Lathrop, *Innocent Blood . . .* (Boston, 1771), p. i.

[6] Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 61-62; Thornton, *Pulpit*, p. 165.

[7] BNL, Mar. 21, 1771, p. 3; EG, Mar. 12, 1771, p. 3; Baldwin, *Clergy*, p. 113; Van Tyne, "Clergy," p. 53.

[8] Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, p. 18; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 68-72; EG, Feb. 2, 1773, p. 4.

[9] EJ, Mar. 9, 1774, p. 3; Mar. 8, 1775, p. 3; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 92, 138.

[10] Baldwin, *Clergy*, p. 113.

[11] Brown, *Massachusetts Politics*, pp. 58-59, provides a complete list of committee members; *Votes and Proceedings . . .* (Boston, [1772]), pp. iv, 1-2.

[12] Brown, *Massachusetts Politics*, pp. 143-48; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 72-75; Jensen, *Founding*, p. 420.

[13] Zobel, *Massacre*, pp. 210-13; Kidder, *History*, p. 114; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 57-60; Bailyn, *Pamphlets*, p. 72, note 21.

[14] A Short Narrative . . . (Boston, 1770), in Kidder, History, pp. 25-29.

[15] Proceedings of His Majesty's Council . . . (Boston, 1770), p. 9; Adams, Bibliography, pp. 60-61; Additional Observations . . . (Boston, 1770), in Kidder, History, pp. 114-22; BNL, Sept. 27, 1770, p. 4.

[16] Lathrop, Innocent Blood . . . , pp. i-iv, 3-19.

[17] Charles Chauncey, Trust in God . . . (Boston, 1770), pp. 34-35; Samuel Cooke, A Sermon Preached at Cambridge . . . (Boston, 1770), in Thornton, Pulpit, pp. 165-66.

[18] James Lovell, An Oration Delivered April 2d, 1771 . . . (Boston, 1771), in Hezekiah Niles (ed.), Principles and Acts of the American Revolution (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1876), pp. 17-18.

[19] James Warren, An Oration Delivered March 5th, 1772 . . . (Boston, 1772), in Niles, Principles and Acts, pp. 20-23.

[20] Potter, Idiom, p. 255; Benjamin Church, An Oration Delivered March Fifth, 1773 . . . (Boston, 1773), in Niles, Principles and Acts, p. 37.

[21] John Hancock, An Oration Delivered March 5, 1774 . . . (Boston, 1774), in Niles, Principles and Acts, pp. 38-41.

[22] Joseph Warren, An Oration Delivered March Sixth, 1775 . . . (Boston, 1775), in Niles, Principles and Acts, pp. 27-29. Warren's orations are also reproduced in Cary, Warren, pp. 106-09, 174-77, and Richard Frothingham, Life and Times of Joseph Warren (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865), pp. 171-79, 425-40.

[23] In addition to pamphlets in the Boston Massacre collection (Appendix B), three others discussed the problem of standing armies during this period. Titles are listed in the Bibliography.

[24] Simeon Howard, A Sermon Preached To The . . . Artillery-Company . . . (Boston, 1773), pp. 6-27, 39.

[25] Josiah Quincy, Observations On The . . . Boston Port-Bill . . . (Boston, 1774), pp. 29, 46-47.

[26] /William H. Drayton/ A Letter From a Freeman . . . (Charles-Town, 1774), pp. 27-28; Adams, Bibliography, p. 86.

[27] *No Standing Army in the British Colonies . . .* (New York, 1775), p. 16.

[28] Thomas Bolton, *An Oration Delivered March Fifteenth, 1775 . . .* (/Boston/ 1775), pp. 1-2; John Mein, *Sagittarius's Letters . . .* (Boston, 1775), pp. 2-3; /Daniel Leonard/ *The Origin of the American Contest . . .* (New York, 1775), pp. 19-20, 48; Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. 118, 134-37.

[27] No Standing Army in the British Colonies . . . (New York, 1775), p. 16.

[28] Thomas Bolton, An Oration Delivered March Fifteenth, 1775 . . . [Boston, 1775], pp. 1-2; John Mein, Sagittarius's Letters . . . (Boston, 1775), pp. 2-3; [Daniel Leonard] The Origin of the American Contest . . . (New York, 1775), pp. 19-20, 4n; Adams, Bibliography, pp. 118, 134-37.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

CHAPTER VI

AN ACCUMULATION OF PERSUASION

During the five years that passed between the killings in Boston and the Battle of Lexington and Concord, the Massacre never disappeared from public view, but it elicited peaks of attention in the various channels of public communications. And, while the affair drew simultaneous attention in several media, one usually dominated in keeping the subject alive. This chapter focuses on the relationship among time, volume of coverage, and content of messages in order to compare the role played by each medium in telling the story of the Massacre in each of the six colonies.

Newspaper Dominance in Midst of Declining Attention over Time

In quantitative terms, media interest in the Massacre in the six colonies studied peaked in the first year following the tragedy, then lessened rapidly and considerably over succeeding years. In order to demonstrate the degree of this diminution, Table 7 has been prepared. It combines the number of separate references in messages about the Massacre previously displayed in Tables 1-6 into

a form which better enables the reader to visualize the relative amount of attention each medium devoted to the affair over the five-year period.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF MESSAGES REFERRING TO BOSTON MASSACRE: MEDIUM BY YEAR

Medium	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	Total
Newspapers	222	60	25	26	18	12	363
Sermons and Orations	4	4	2	3	3	2	18
Pamphlets	8	3	2	6	10	8	37
Total	234	67	29	35	31	22	418

From March 5, 1770--the day of the killings--through the end of 1770, the various media collectively provided nearly 60 per cent of all separate messages about the Massacre that they would during all five years. Succeeding references made to the affair in 1771 ended with the first anniversary celebration. Thus, within the first full year following the incident, three-quarters of all messages mentioning the Massacre in the six colonies had been transmitted through channels of public communications. (Table 7)

Table 7 must be read with caution, because it in no way discriminates between the two-paragraph newspaper story or single-sentence mention by pamphlet of the Massacre, on

the one hand, and the extended treatment in any medium on the other. It is merely a summary of the evidence of the Massacre by the various media. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the study of newspaper content about the Massacre after the first anniversary--that is, in the years following 1771--was performed only for the two-month period either side of the anniversary; a substantial number of newspaper mentions may have appeared during the unexamined months. To indicate relative substance and length of separate messages:

> From the killings through the first anniversary, at least 17 newspaper articles were a page or more, while at least 44 others ran a column or longer. After 1771, however, only nine newspaper accounts of the Massacre exceeded one column, while just seven others--memorial proclamations--were longer than two or three paragraphs.
>
> Of the 18 sermons and orations, 14 messages were as much as a page long, and 11 were devoted almost entirely to the Massacre, as they were delivered on the occasion of the shootings or anniversaries.
>
> Then, of the 37 pamphlets, 27 were at least a page in length, while 16 were devoted almost entirely to the affair, as they were printed as a result of the killings, trials, or commemorations.

the one hand, and the extended treatment in any medium on the other. It is merely a summary of the evidence of the Massacre by the various media. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the study of newspaper content about the Massacre after the first anniversary—that is, in the years following 1771—was performed only for the two-month period either side of the anniversary; a substantial number of newspaper mentions may have appeared during the unexamined months. To indicate relative substance and length of separate messages:

From the killings through the first anniversary, at least 17 newspaper articles were a page or more, while at least 14 others ran a column or longer. After 1771, however, only nine newspaper accounts of the massacre exceeded one column, while just seven others—essential proclamations—were longer than two or three paragraphs.

Of the 18 sermons and orations, 14 messages were as much as a page long, and 11 were devoted almost entirely to the massacre, as they were delivered on the occasion of the shootings or anniversaries.

Then, of the 37 pamphlets, 27 were at least a page in length, while 15 were devoted almost entirely to the affair, as they were printed as a result of the killings, trials, or commemorations.

In that first year, media attention centered upon, but was not limited to, events associated with the affair: the killings themselves, trials, and anniversary celebration. Within three weeks after the initial break in news coverage of the shootings newspapers turned again to the subject of the Massacre. From the last day in April until the beginning of the trials in late October, a major newspaper article, sermon, or pamphlet discussed the Massacre almost every month. Following the trials the newspaper debate between Sam Adams and Jonathan Sewall, coupled with publication of the trial-record pamphlet, overlapped by five weeks calls in the press for annual commemorations of the "horrid Massacre," thus filling the gap until the first anniversary.

By comparison with the relatively full and continuous coverage of the Massacre in the first year following the incident, channels of communications devoted substantially less time and space to the affair over the next four years. By 1775 the number of messages had diminished to less than 10 per cent of what it had been four years earlier. (Table 7)

References to the Massacre after 1771 were made mainly in conjunction with anniversary celebrations. However, as political discussion began to increase in 1773--concurrently with mounting tensions between Great Britain and her colonies--the media also discussed the Massacre

during intermediate periods. June, 1773, saw the affair communicated three times, while the summer of 1774 brought five references to it. Then, during the first four months of 1775, public communications addressed the subject on four occasions not directly connected to the anniversary celebration of that year.

Table 7 also shows the dominance of newspapers over other forms of communication in placing the Massacre before the public. During the first year following the killings, newspapers accounted for 93 per cent of the messages which were transmitted to the public. Even as their dominance dwindled over time in comparison to pamphlets, sermons, and orations, it never fell below the near-parity reached in 1775. For the five-year period, approximately 87 per cent of all references to the affair appeared in the press.

Newspapers not only held a numerical preeminence, but they also led in presenting argument about the Massacre. Through the first year following the incident, newspapers both initiated all major argument and introduced all principal themes concerning the affair, which circulated in the various media over the five years. This was the "big moment" for the press, and all but two newspaper articles making substantial reference to the Massacre were printed at this time.

Pamphlets, sermons, and orations augmented what first appeared in newspapers; they never initiated

discussion and argument. Even in later years, when pamphlets became relatively more important in the continuing discussion of the Massacre, the argument they presented was nothing more than an expansion of what newspapers first introduced during the year following the killings.

Newspapers Dominate Despite Diminished Interest Outside Massachusetts

Not only was media interest in the Massacre characterized by a rapid and substantial decline over time, but it diminished considerably outside Massachusetts. Table 8 depicts the number of separate messages about the Massacre made by each medium in each of the six colonies. Used in conjunction with Table 7, it should enable the reader to obtain a fuller picture of how, when, where, and in what proportion channels of public communications sent the story of the Massacre to the people. The same caution must be used in reading this table as in reading Table 7.

Approximately 57 per cent of all references to the Massacre by public communications over five years occurred in Massachusetts. The most interest mustered by the media in any of the other five colonies came in Connecticut and Pennsylvania--each providing about one-quarter of that provided in the Bay Colony. In New York and South Carolina, media coverage of the Massacre in each amounted to approximately five per cent of the total, with Virginia falling

below that paltry percentage. In fact, the press in Virginia produced only about six per cent of what the media in Massachusetts provided. (Table 8)

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF MESSAGES REFERRING TO BOSTON MASSACRE: MEDIUM BY COLONY

Medium	Mass.	Conn.	N. Y.	Pa.	Va.	S. C.	Total
Newspapers	197	53	21	59	14	19	363
Sermons and orations	17	1					18
Pamphlets	25	4	3	3		2	37
Total	239	58	24	62	14	21	418

While the media showed relatively little interest in the Massacre outside Massachusetts, Table 8 shows that newspapers were, in fact, the principal public channel by which the other five colonies learned about the affair. What information was printed in Virginia was provided solely by newspaper accounts; no pamphlet was printed there. And, Connecticut was the only colony besides Massachusetts in which a sermon or oration addressing the subject was delivered. Pamphlets provided the other five colonies somewhat more exposure to the Massacre, but in comparison to newspapers, it was still minimal. Only in New York did

pamphlets represent more than 10 per cent of the total references to the affair. Additionally, the small number of different pamphlets distributed in any one colony over five years indicates the relative infrequency of use of that form of communications in keeping the subject before the public.

In Massachusetts, however, the situation was somewhat different. Most of the important pamphlets were published there--many in more than one edition or printing--and all the sermons and orations occurred there, save one. Although the percentage comparison with the number of newspaper articles is small--pamphlets, sermons, and orations represented about 17 per cent of total references to the Massacre--the actual number of different pamphlets printed and orations and sermons delivered was substantial. (Table 8) Consequently, they probably contributed much to the body of information and argument about the Massacre available in Massachusetts. But, it is important to note again that they presented nothing that newspapers had not placed first before the public. Thus, they followed the lead of the press, augmenting and reinforcing rather than innovating.

Prominence of the Whig View

Regardless of communication form, content of messages about the Massacre was designed to persuade

receivers to adopt a partisan view of the affair. Only about 14 per cent of newspaper articles eliminated bias. (Tables 1-3) Pamphlets, and the other forms of communication which were reprinted as pamphlets (sermons, orations, etc.), never did. Both sides of the story were exposed to the public, but always in a partisan account. No writer or speaker attempted to analyze and compare divergent views of the affair. A reader or listener had to seek out differing versions, before balancing and weighing conflicting views.

In the process of obtaining news about the Massacre, the receiver faced a preponderance of Whig-biased material. Approximately 75 per cent of newspaper accounts were slanted in favor of the Whigs' concept of the incident. (Tables 1-3) In articles supplied by partisan writers, printers graphically portrayed the killings as a "horrid Massacre"; exposed the affair as the consequence of a dark conspiracy against liberty; tried to discredit the soldiers before, during, and after their trials for murder; and promoted and publicized the anniversary celebrations with their commemorative orations and displays. Additionally, the press reprinted one of the orations, one of only two "proceedings" in which committees of correspondence referred to the Massacre, and published several proclamations memorializing the affair.

Other forms of communications displayed an even greater percentage of Whig bias in discussing the Massacre.

All sermons espoused the Whig view, as did approximately nine out of every ten pamphlets. Of six orations known to have addressed the incident, five projected the Whig side of the argument.

The predominance of Whig-biased communications about the Massacre carried into Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and South Carolina, varying in each principally in terms of volume. In five of the six colonies, therefore, a receiver of information about the Massacre was likeliest to get a picture of the affair primarily as the Whigs saw it.

New York was an exception. Over five years, press coverage there was essentially neutral, as the total number of neutral and Tory-biased newspaper articles actually came to one more than the number favoring a Whig view. (Tables 1-3) And, even the Whig accounts lacked the polemical vigor of those which were printed in other colonies. Of the three pamphlets printed in New York, two provided a Tory view of the Massacre, making New York the only colony other than Massachusetts to print a Tory pamphlet mentioning the Massacre.

A Shift in Emphasis: Qualitative Factors

To examine media coverage of the Massacre over time and by colony and bias merely in terms of quantity of references is simplistic. Volume alone is something less

than a totally accurate indicator of what Americans knew about the affair over the five years from 1770 to 1775, and of the comparative role of the various media in bringing news to them. We have said that newspapers dominated other forms of public communications both in telling the story of the Massacre over time and transmitting messages to all six colonies studied. But we have also indicated that there was a shift toward pamphlets, sermons, and orations after 1771. For an explanation of what this shift meant and a fuller understanding of the complex relationship that existed among the various media, we must look to the factor of qualitative nature in message content as opposed to quantity of messages transmitted.

The Massacre received peak attention in the year following the killings, as newspapers dominated the numerically overwhelming Whig effort at persuasion. Over the next four years newspapers continued to report each anniversary, producing more than a hundred articles (Table 3), but they no longer presented detailed argument. Articles were substantially shorter than previously and contained little discussion. The press remained biased, however, furthering the Whig view of the affair by continually referring to it as the "horrid Massacre," describing the commemorative displays, announcing subjects of the annual orations, and publishing memorial proclamations. But after the first year, only twice--in 1773 and 1775--did

newspapers print substantial argument concerning the Massacre.

From 1771 on, and particularly after 1773, discussion of the Massacre was better suited to the pamphlet, sermon, and oration where time and space permitted all aspects of the affair to be gathered together and presented in larger context--and that context was the growing issues of "constitutionality." After 1773, the newspaper was absorbed with the onrush of events, incidents, happenings; the constitutional issue, complex and basic, required putting the revolutionary events into its own context. Here the pamphlet served better than the newspaper.[1]

The period 1773-1775 was one of rapidly accelerating tension between America and Great Britain; a period when influential lawyers, merchants, planters, and ministers used pamphlets to debate constitutional questions involving the depth to which England was denying the colonies rights guaranteed and protected under the English constitution and common law, but deriving ultimately from the "abstract universals of natural rights." In this atmosphere, pamphleteers elevated the meaning of the Massacre to a high level of principle and legality. They gave it a quality which transcended mere events. It made little difference whether their references were substantial, as in pamphlets which were occasioned by the anniversaries or made other direct mention of the Massacre, or minimal, as with those

which referred obliquely to the affair. All fitted the Massacre into the raging constitutional argument as yet another grievance in which the mother country was abrogating constitutional liberties in America. It became what Bernard Bailyn described as "a great, transforming debate"; a debate in which the Whigs continued to convert loyalty and contentment with Great Britain into a move for independence and a war to achieve it.[2]

After 1773, then, newspapers and pamphlets (including sermons and orations) served mutually supporting, but qualitatively different, functions in keeping the Massacre alive. On the one hand, newspapers maintained the Massacre in public view with occasional stories about the annual commemorations, which clearly represented them in the Whig view. On the other hand, pamphlets assumed the task of debating the larger meaning of the affair relating to the constitutional question.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VI

[1] Bailyn, *Pamphlets*, I, pp. 4, 17; pp. 3-17 contains the latest interpretation of the function pamphlets performed as a means by which Americans expressed political theory, opinion, argument, and polemic.

[2] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 44; Bailyn, *Pamphlets*, I, p. 13; Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, pp. 21, 188. In pp. 160-229 Bailyn provides a full discussion of this constitutional transformation.

CHAPTER VII

ANSWERS, INFERENCES, AND SOME REMAINING QUESTIONS

Questions Answered

In attempting to assess the significance of the Boston Massacre and estimate relative impact of the various media throughout the colonies, we shall turn first to the original questions for which the study sought answers. They provide a framework for understanding the larger propositions.

In answer to the closely related questions of what was known about the Massacre throughout the colonies and what central themes diffused, evidence shows that the principal message transmitted by all channels of public communications was that the Massacre was the inevitable consequence of a standing army stationed "illegally" among civilians in time of peace; that the army was inherently evil and threatened liberty. This message received fullest exposure in Massachusetts, diminishing in Connecticut and Pennsylvania--but still present to a significant degree. It was revealed to a much lesser degree in South Carolina and Virginia, but still represented the bulk of limited

information those colonies received. Only in New York was this theme minimized and obscured.

Looking to the extent to which communications favored either a Whig or Tory view of the affair or remained neutral, evidence indicates that for five years the Massacre was kept before the public largely through the efforts of militant Whigs. To accomplish their purpose of persuading the public that the Massacre was the ultimate manifestation of an overriding threat to liberty imposed by the British army, the Whigs used--among other things, newspapers, sermons, and pamphlets. No Tory minister opposed the Whigs, and the number of different pamphlets the Whigs printed exceeded those of the Tories by more than six times.

In presenting their newspaper case, the Whigs overwhelmed their opposition in number and size of articles and stridency of polemics. Perhaps nothing illustrates better the Whig dominance of the press than the manner in which they were able to use all newspapers in Massachusetts, even those which normally supported the Tories or usually tried to print both sides of an issue. Faced with the preponderance of Whig material, vis-a-vis Tory, printers had little alternative to emphasizing a Whig view of the Massacre. Several times Whig writers provided articles which were used by more than one newspaper at the same time. For instance, in the week following the killings,

all newspapers in Boston printed essentially the same story about the incident. Although the various accounts differed in length, and some contained more polemics than others, all appear to have come from a single source. Large portions of those appearing in the Boston Gazette, Evening-Post, and Post-Boy on March 12, 1770, were so similar that each printer seems to have had access to a single "news release" from which he simply edited his own article to taste. In reporting anniversary celebrations in 1772, 1773, and 1774, Boston's newspapers printed on the same day again carried nearly identical stories. Nothing can account for this behavior other than the printers' receiving a standard news article. Regardless of partisan political stance, if newspapers were to cover the Massacre, they had to take what was supplied by the Whigs.[1]

In the matter of which channel of public communications provided the fullest coverage of the Massacre, evidence strongly favors newspapers. By the total volume of messages and amount of argument they carried, coupled with initiation of major debate and sustaining performance over time and through all six colonies, newspapers were the principal means by which the Whigs maintained the Massacre in the public's view. There was simply no other method in Virginia. To varying degrees, pamphlets augmented the press in the other five colonies, and sermons similarly reinforced newspapers in Massachusetts, but nowhere did

these other forms really come close to matching newspapers.

Newspapers probably enjoyed greater circulation than other forms of public communication, thus adding to their dominance in transmitting word of the Massacre. Of newspaper circulation, Schlesinger says the figures are "fragmentary and unverifiable," but "possess an inherent credibility." According to him, "circulation in major towns /Boston, New York, and Philadelphia/ in the period from the Stamp Act onward averaged 1475 per newspaper until the climactic events of 1774 and 1775 raised the number to 2520." His figures for smaller communities like Salem, Massachusetts, Hartford, Connecticut, and Williamsburg, Virginia, average about 800. Even if his figures are halved, weekly circulation in 1770 in Boston--with its five newspapers--would have amounted to 3500 copies. In a city of about 15,000, that means the press exposed a sizable portion of the adult population to what the Whigs were saying about the Massacre.[2]

By contrast with the newspaper effort, the clergy's contribution to public dialogue over the Massacre amounted to only 12 sermons (that we know of) for the five years. And, 11 of these were preached in Massachusetts. Nonetheless, in helping spread the word of the Massacre, the clergy showed their willingness to deal with what was essentially a political subject. This participation by the ministers substantiates historians' claims to their

involvement in politics as well as religion.

Pamphlets also performed their traditional function in communicating the Massacre. Not only were they used to spread further, messages about the Massacre originated in other forms of communications, but they also provided a handy method by which authors articulated basic themes in larger context.[3]

Their greatest impact, however, was probably upon the colonial leader. According to Philip Davidson, pamphlets appealed mainly to intellectuals. Schlesinger supports Davidson's view by saying their function was "to unify the thinking of leaders" and "persuade the educated classes." Bernard Bailyn, the foremost authority on the role of pamphlets in the American Revolution, implies the same. While Bailyn makes no categorical statements similar to those of Davidson and Schlesinger, he says that pamphlets presented the "leading or dominant ideas of . . . the leaders of the Revolutionary movement, and it is their thought at each stage of the developing rebellion that I attempted to present . . . ." Therefore we may infer that pamphlets circulated to a different and probably much smaller--albeit more influential--audience than newspapers.[4]

The final question asked if Schlesinger's credit to the newspapers as the principal vehicle for fomenting revolution was valid in the case of the Massacre. The preponderance of Whig argument contained in the press

coupled with the dominance of newspapers over other forms of communications in transmitting that argument to the public largely substantiates his position on the revolutionary role of the press.[5]

This credit does not suggest, however, that newspapers in all colonies necessarily viewed the Massacre equally as a major grievance against Great Britain, or that public reaction to the argument they carried was the same overall. It merely recognizes the dominant function performed by the press, in relation to other forms of public communications, in carrying Whig revolutionary thought about the Massacre to the people. The significance of the Massacre is a separate question with which we shall deal shortly.

Political Reputations of Newspapers

Considering the preponderance of Whig material available, most newspapers throughout the colonies covered the Massacre in a manner reasonably consistent with their political reputations. The Whig press featured the affair more strongly than Tory newspapers as it carried most of the substantial Whig argument. Tory papers, while largely compelled to print Whig accounts of the affair, if they were to cover it at all, did not match the volume and argument of their Whig counterparts. To a substantial degree, Tory printers edited out the stronger Whig polemics.

There are three notable exceptions to the generalization concerning consistency of printing by newspapers in relation to their political reputations, and they deserve special mention. One was in Boston and two in New York.

Of the newspapers with a Tory reputation, the Boston News-Letter printed the greatest number of Whig-biased accounts. With the relatively large amount of Whig material he printed (compared with the amounts which appeared in other Tory newspapers), Richard Draper went beyond merely printing "what was available." He almost seemed to embrace the Whig position on the affair. There are no final explanations for this; just some suppositions. Seeing John Mein forced out of business by the Whigs because of his fight against non-importation may have caused Draper to fear the same if he fought the Tory battle or minimized the Whig position. Schlesinger implies this when he says Draper "trimmed his journalistic sails to the prevailing wind." And, that "wind" was definitely Whig in the case of the Massacre. Yodelis, on the other hand, would question this suggestion of coercion. She contends that Whig attempts to pressure Tory newspapers into printing news favorable to the Whig cause had little effect on printers. Her recent study shows that partisan political position did not keep any Boston printer from advertising in other newspapers, and no newspaper lost advertising because of its political stance. Then, as now, advertising

was largely what kept newspapers in business. It is possible, then, that Draper was simply appalled by the killings, and given a large degree of press freedom, reacted as an "American" printer rather than a Tory sympathizer.[6]

While a supposedly ardent Tory newspaper in Boston seemed to exceed the bounds of necessity in printing Whig material about the Massacre, two newspapers in New York with strong Whig reputations paid relatively little attention to the incident. Although John Holt had previously joined in agitating against British soldiers' coming to Boston, he rejected an obvious attempt by the Boston Whigs to spread their view of the Massacre to New York in the weeks following the killings. Thereafter, by printing relatively few and mainly neutral accounts, he virtually ignored continuing aspects of the affair. Overall, Holt simply minimized the Massacre in his New York Journal. So did James Parker, the other staunch Whig printer in New York--that is, until his death in June, 1770.

Schlesinger's belief that strong pressure from the government constrained Holt's and Parker's printing activities on behalf of the Whigs in 1770 offers a possible explanation for their failure to seize upon the Massacre, at least to the degree that Whig newspapers in neighboring colonies did. But, this contention is largely unproven, and it fails to resolve the question of why Holt continued to neglect the Massacre over the next four years.[7]

Who Cared About the Massacre?

Historians and famous persons in American history who have asserted that the Boston Massacre had deep meaning for all colonies have done so on the basis of small evidence. This study of the channels of public communications adds little weight to that evidence. Information about the event was widely circulated by newspapers, pamphlets, and sermons only in Massachusetts, and only there was it associated with substantial public response over five years. Apparently no other colony instituted anniversary celebrations. If one did, the event was of such minor importance that it failed to elicit public mention. Public reaction was strong in Massachusetts where numerous towns supported Boston after the killings. And, two towns besides Boston are recorded as having conducted commemorations of the Massacre. Many persons wrote newspaper articles and pamphlets addressing the subject, while clergymen are known to have preached 11 sermons about it.

One other colony--Connecticut--combined substantial media interest in the Massacre with significant public response. Newspapers there reprinted substantial amounts of material taken from the press in Massachusetts, particularly in the year following the killings. Several Connecticut writers responded with newspaper articles, and others were omitted from the press for lack of space. One sermon addressing the Massacre is known to have been

preached in the colony, and more pamphlets were printed there than in any other colony outside Massachusetts. Even this amount of interest, however, failed to approach that displayed by Massachusetts.

Pennsylvania was the only other colony in which public communications showed substantial interest in the Massacre. Newspapers in the colony reprinted about the same number and variety of articles about the Massacre as those in Connecticut. Press coverage in both colonies, in fact, was remarkably similar. Several pamphlets mentioning the affair were also printed in Pennsylvania. Other than pamphleteering, however, channels of public communication reveal no public outrage or reaction to news of the Massacre.

Response to the Massacre in New York, Virginia, and South Carolina matched the minimum amount of attention paid the affair by public communications in each. Press coverage in New York was minimal, falling considerably below that of Connecticut and Pennsylvania, and essentially neutral. Three pamphlets were printed in the colony, two of which originated there. The only other known public response in New York to the Massacre was a single inquiry about the affair by a New York citizen to a friend in Boston, the answer to which appeared in the press.

Newspapers in South Carolina gave the Massacre about the same amount of attention as those in New York, preached in the colony, and more pamphlets were printed there than in any other colony outside Massachusetts. Even this amount of interest, however, failed to approach that displayed by Massachusetts.

Pennsylvania was the only other colony in which public communications showed substantial interest in the Massacre. Newspapers in the colony reprinted about the same number and variety of articles about the Massacre as those in Connecticut. Press coverage in both colonies, in fact, was remarkably similar. Several pamphlets concerning the affair were also printed in Pennsylvania. Other than pamphleteering, however, channels of public communication reveal no public outrage or reaction to news of the Massacre.

Response to the Massacre in New York, Virginia, and South Carolina marked the minimum amount of attention paid the affair by public communications in each. Press coverage in New York was minimal, falling considerably below that of Connecticut and Pennsylvania, and essentially neutral. Three pamphlets were printed in the colony, two of which originated there. The only other known public response in New York to the Massacre was a single inquiry about the affair by a New York citizen to a friend in Boston, the answer to which appeared in the press.

Newspapers in South Carolina gave the Massacre about the same amount of attention as those in New York.

while the press in Virginia offered somewhat less volume. In both Southern colonies, newspapers expressed a stronger Whig view of the affair than those in New York, with South Carolina's press emphasizing it more than Virginia's. However, newspapers in both colonies carried comparatively little about the Massacre subsequent to the summer of 1770. In Virginia there was simply no public interest other than that shown by the press. Additional public response in South Carolina consisted of a single pamphlet written by radical Whig William Henry Drayton and the importation by Tory printer Robert Wells, of the record of the trial.

No distinct pattern of interest in the Massacre is revealed through all six colonies. Overall, this writer is struck by the relative lack of impact of the event outside Massachusetts--even in Connecticut and Pennsylvania where it was portrayed to the public to a significant degree. To fully examine the question of why the Massacre impacted as it did is beyond the scope of this study, but some relationships may be shown and inferences drawn.

Distance had bearing on how the Massacre was treated by various communications media, and received by the public. Of the colonies outside Massachusetts, Connecticut--a neighbor--showed greatest interest and recorded the most significant public response to the affair. Newspaper articles of New Hampshire origin, which appeared in the Massachusetts press, suggest that colony also

responded to the Massacre. Given this interest by three New England colonies, a fourth--Rhode Island--may have been receptive to news of the Massacre, as well.

Beyond Massachusetts, however, any attempt to generalize about the effects of distance is largely defeated by inconsistencies in the relationship between distance and interest. Granted that the southern colonies --as a section--showed the least interest; yet, distance was not a factor in New York. That colony had at least as much opportunity to receive information as Pennsylvania, but its newspapers published nowhere near the volume or polemics of those of its neighbors to the south, thus turning around the concept of distance as a reliable indicator. Then too, public channels of communications in South Carolina had more to say about the Massacre than those in Virginia, again to the weakening of a distance theory.

Tied closely to distance as a possible factor for explaining how interest in the Massacre developed throughout the colonies is the degree of difficulty any colony had in obtaining news about the affair. Reprinting of Massacre stories on a regular basis in newspapers south through Pennsylvania indicates that postal service was reliable and consistent. Indeed, this ready availability of news may partially explain why Pennsylvania newspapers covered the Massacre as well as those in Connecticut. But, as already

noted, access to news through a reasonably reliable communications system fails to account for New York's indifference to the Massacre. If anything, the opposite should have been the case.

Different lines of communication coupled with irregular service may explain, to some degree, the limited news coverage in the southern colonies. South Carolina received its news from the north by sea; Virginia overland. Ship service, though irregular, could have provided more newspapers to South Carolina than the postal rider brought to Virginia. But this is pure supposition. We lack information as to which newspapers South Carolina and Virginia received, and when. This study suggests that Virginia printers awaited newspapers from Philadelphia. But which newspapers? We do not know whether they got only those from Pennsylvania, or whether the post brought papers from New York, Connecticut, and Boston as well. Virtually the same questions apply to South Carolina. From where did the ships come? Which newspapers did they carry? In the case of the Massacre, Boston papers were used by both Peter Timothy and Charles Crouch for their first accounts of the killings, while Robert Wells went to New York sources brought by the same ship. But this is insufficient information to permit drawing general conclusions as to the influence of lines of communication on the manner in which the Massacre was treated in South Carolina and Virginia.

It merely suggests that the former's printers may have had more direct access to Boston news than those of the latter.

Political advocacy, particularly support for Whig causes, was also a factor of some importance to the question of why printers handled the Massacre as they did. One might expect that the dominant Whig view would be accepted by Whig printers. Thus, the attention given the Massacre by the predominantly Whig press in Connecticut and Pennsylvania is predictable. So is the somewhat stronger view of the affair provided by the South Carolina papers, as contrasted with those in Virginia. Peter Timothy and Charles Crouch had stronger Whig reputations than any of the printers of the various *Virginia Gazettes*. But again, New York does not fit the pattern, because John Holt and James Parker provided minimum coverage of the affair.

There appears to be a positive relationship between the amount of attention paid the Massacre by the media and the degree of popular response elicited. Massachusetts, with the largest display of media interest, showed the greatest popular outcry. Connecticut was next in media attention to the affair (actually about equal with Pennsylvania), and second in amount of popular outrage. Public communications in New York, South Carolina, and Virginia paid minimum attention to the Massacre, and no popular response is indicated in any of them. Pennsylvania is the exception to this relationship. With about the same media

attention to the Massacre as in Connecticut, Pennsylvania failed to display any popular interest.

None of these factors by itself provides convincing argument for why the Massacre impacted as it did. Collectively they also lack strong persuasion. There is an element associated with the Massacre, however, which has greater applicability for all colonies, and logically fits the context in which the Whigs presented the killings. The major theme stressed in the bulk of Whig messages about the Massacre was the evil of a standing army stationed among civilians in time of peace; in this case, the British army living in Boston. But, was that army really evil; or rather, was it viewed as evil by all Americans? If the army was not universally perceived as the great threat to liberty pictured by the Whigs, then the Boston Massacre could hardly be viewed by all with the alarm that it was in Massachusetts.

This study can not examine this hypothesis in detail, but John Shy's Toward Lexington--the single full study dealing with the part the British army stationed in America contributed to the American Revolution--takes the position that the army was really feared only in Massachusetts until just prior to the outbreak of warfare. I shall present only some of his argument here. To appreciate it fully, the entire work must be read.[8]

Shy begins by pointing out that Americans were not

opposed to the use of military force. Each colony had its local militia, which had augmented British regulars for many years. Militia duty was an accepted part of life for men in colonial America. And, in the brief review of the Boston Massacre pamphlets, we have seen this demonstrated by writers who advocated militia as the best means of protection for the colonies.[9]

Then, too, the British army fought a major war against the French in America, preserving the security of the colonies under the British flag. Many colonials willingly fought in that war both as regulars and as militia. A warm comradeship existed between British soldiers and American civilians as a result of that experience.[10]

But this agreeable situation began to deteriorate following the peace in 1763, eventually breaking down completely in 1775 with war. "These years of political conflict," Shy says, "had leached away much of the sentimental, wartime affection for the army." But, like the move for independence, the process was slow and not supported by the whole population. American attitudes toward the army "hardened, but never crystallized around the army as a major grievance in itself." As Shy sees it: "Americans acted as if they did not truly want to make the army a major issue." The reason "is obscure but surely involves an intricate tangle of fondness and fear," where

"discontented people feel the need to act as if soldiers are themselves not the target of political attack . . . but guiltless instruments of an oppressive government."[11]

Shy also points out that economic benefits accruing to America from the army's presence mitigated against fear and distrust. He estimates that the army brought about £ 300,000 Sterling into America each year. "In an economy with a chronic imbalance of payments and shortage of hard money," he says, "and with total imports of roughly £ 2,000,000, this injection of specie was of some importance."[12]

Most important, this writer believes, are the comments Shy makes about how the army was received in the various colonies. Prior to 1775, Virginia never had British troops stationed on her soil, while Connecticut saw them only sporadically. South Carolina had garrisons on the frontier and in Charleston over the years. Relations between troops and civilians always remained cordial, however, even when South Carolina supported Boston's stand--in 1768 and 1769--against introduction of troops there. British officers in Charleston could report, therefore, that "The people are very civil and polite. We receive all kinds of civilities from the hospitable inhabitants of this pretty town. . . ."[13]

In the middle colonies, Pennsylvania, which had a battalion of British troops stationed at Philadelphia by

"Discontented people feel the need to act as if soldiers are themselves not the target of political attack . . . but guiltless instruments of an oppressive government."[11]

Shy also points out that economic benefits accruing to America from the army's presence mitigated against fear and distrust. He estimates that the army brought about £ 200,000 sterling into America each year. "In an economy with a chronic imbalance of payments and shortage of hard money," he says, "and with total exports of roughly £ 2,000,000, this injection of specie was of some importance."[12]

Most important, this writer believes, are the comments Shy makes about how the army was received in the various colonies. Prior to 1775, Virginia never had British troops stationed on her soil, while Connecticut saw them only sporadically. South Carolina had garrisons on the frontier and in Charleston over the years. Relations between troops and civilians always remained cordial, however, even when South Carolina supported Boston's stand—in 1765 and 1768—against introduction of troops there. British officers in Charleston could report, therefore, that "the people are very civil and polite. We receive all kinds of civilities from the hospitable inhabitants of this pretty town. . . ."[13]

In the middle colonies, Pennsylvania, which had a battalion of British troops stationed at Philadelphia by

1772, encountered no difficulties in its relations with them. Even in New York, where numerous minor altercations had taken place between British troops and citizens over the Quartering Act, amicable relations between officers and "gentry" had smoothed over the more difficult situations. Despite the potential for it, Shy says that real violence never developed there.[14]

But the situation was different and unique in Boston. In Shy's words:

> . . . that exception is all important. There, where no regular garrison had been since the war, soldiers came again to disrupt the life of the city; there the danger of coercion had been faced squarely, rather than obliquely as elsewhere, because it could not be deflected by the habitual presence of regulars or by the question of defense against external attack. The result was to stifle fondness and to transform fear from inhibition into a new source of energy and determination. There, in 1775, war would begin. It could have begun nowhere else.[15]

Shy's analysis of the general respect for and good relations with the army enjoyed by all colonies except Massachusetts--and possibly New York--squares most closely with reactions of the various colonies to the Boston Massacre. His evidence argues strongly that little objective reality existed outside Massachusetts for fear and distrust of the army. Hence, most citizens could view the Massacre as little more than a local confrontation, not as an overriding threat to liberty. Thus, the Whig argument fell largely on "deaf ears."

Shy's thesis is not a perfect fit, but taken in conjunction with the other factors already discussed, it makes sense in most cases. Lack of fear of the military in Connecticut could have been partially offset by a combination of a feeling of neighborliness for Boston and strong Whig sentiments of the printers. Whig advocacy by printers in Pennsylvania probably accounts for the relatively large volume of newspaper coverage the Massacre received in that colony, while basic trust for the army negated popular resentment for the affair. Distance, unreliable communications, and lack of a strong Whig press, combined with no experience with the British army best explain Virginia's low level of involvement in the affair. And, in South Carolina, presence of militant Whig printers is the likely reason for the press in that colony providing a larger Whig view of the Massacre.

New York remains a largely unexplained exception. Distance, communications difficulties, and political stance of printers lack validity as explanations for New York's neutral reception of the Massacre. Even Shy's otherwise persuasive concept of lack of fear of the army is weakest in the colony where General Gage had his headquarters. Although New York never had a "massacre," relations between British soldiers and citizens were not nearly as amicable as in other colonies. New York's indifference to the Massacre remains an unsolved puzzle.

Thus, the Boston Massacre was not universally viewed throughout the six colonies as a significant event. Local conditions dictated the manner in which it was perceived, and these differed from colony to colony. The popular image of the "horrid Massacre," conceived by the Whigs in Massachusetts and sustained over time by historians, was really that held by the Bay Colony from 1770 until 1775.

Suggestions for Further Study

As with most studies, this one probably asks more questions than it answers. Certainly it reveals several topics for further examination.

The behavior of Richard Draper and his *Boston News-Letter* in reporting the Massacre suggests that historians may be at least partially incorrect in ascribing strong Tory sentiments to this printer and his newspaper. A detailed study of the *News-Letter* during the American Revolution and a biography of Draper are needed. The latter would probably be difficult because of lack of sources, but a content analysis of the former is possible.

The manner in which Whig newspapers in New York, particularly John Holt's *New York Journal*, treated the Massacre, coupled with Schlesinger's suggestion that they were being coerced by the government questions the degree of freedom printers possessed in that colony. A study of

the press in New York, similar to that done by Yodelis for Boston and Teeter for Philadelphia is indicated. Such a study would likely provide an answer to the question of why the Boston Massacre had so little meaning for New York.

Beyond the simple fact that colonial printers obtained most of their news about other colonies by clipping stories from newspapers, little is known about sources of news in the colonial press. A basic question here is: did printers in non-adjacent colonies habitually get their news directly from newspapers of the colony in which events occurred; or did they take articles from an intermediate source? In the case of major news stories about the Boston Massacre, the former method prevailed. The small number of articles traced, however, is insufficient to establish a general pattern. To be most meaningful, a study of this kind should be done over time; not for a single event.

As for the Boston Massacre itself, this study infers that New England was the only section in the colonies where the affair could have had significant impact. This might be tested by examining news coverage of the event in New Hampshire and Rhode Island. And, if one wanted to test this study further, it could be repeated in Maryland and Georgia, as well.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VII

[1] Andrew, "News Dissemination," pp. 113-17, was the first to suggest that a single news source provided original accounts of the Massacre in the *Boston Gazette* and *Evening-Post*.

[2] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 303-304.

[3] See text above notes 27 and 29, Chapter I, for discussion of the roles of the clergy and pamphlets as a means of communication; Davidson, *Propaganda*, p. 210.

[4] Davidson, *Propaganda*, p. 210; Schlesinger, *Prelude*, p. 44; Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, p. x.

[5] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 45-46.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 285; Yodelis, "Paper War," pp. 120, 139-42, 443-46.

[7] Schlesinger, *Prelude*, pp. 113-17.

[8] The last two chapters of Shy, *Toward Lexington*, pp. 321-424, are particularly instructive.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-44.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 45-139.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 140-266; quotes are found on pp. 397-98.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 338-40.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 254, 386; Thad Tate, "The Coming of the Revolution in Virginia: Britain's Challenge to Virginia's Ruling Class, 1763-1776," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., XIX (July, 1962), 324.

[14] Shy, *Toward Lexington*, pp. 388-89, 391.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 398.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

METHOD

During the period covered by this study thirty-four newspapers were printed throughout the colonies. All were English-language except for two German papers printed in Philadelphia. Of these, I examined twenty-eight, skipping only the German papers and those not available through resources of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Not consulted were the Norwich (Conn.) Packet, published 1773-1775; the Salem (Mass.) Gazette, printed from July, 1774, until April, 1775; Story and Humphrey's Pennsylvania Mercury (Philadelphia), which first appeared on April 7, 1775; and the Albany (N. Y.) Gazette, printed between November, 1771, and August, 1772. Because of the relatively short lives of these papers, they probably contributed little to the story of news coverage of the Boston Massacre not contained in the newspapers consulted.[1]

Issues were missing in collections of some of the newspapers. The Massachusetts Spy, begun by Isaiah Thomas in July, 1770,[2] lacked issues between then and November, 1770, and again for 1775. With the exception of two widely scattered issues, the New York Post-Boy was not available from April 9, 1770, until April 8, 1771. Prior to May 25,

APPENDIX A

METHOD

During the period covered by this study thirty-four newspapers were printed throughout the colonies. All were English-language except for two German papers printed in Philadelphia. Of these, I examined twenty-eight, skipping only the German papers and those not available through resources of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Not consulted were the *Norwich* (Conn.) *Packet*, published 1773-1775; the *Salem* (Mass.) *Gazette*, printed from July, 1774, until April, 1775; *Story and Humphrey's Pennsylvania Mercury* (Philadelphia), which first appeared on April 7, 1775; and the *Albany* (N. Y.) *Gazette*, printed between November, 1771, and August, 1772. Because of the relatively short lives of these papers, they probably contributed little to the story of news coverage of the Boston Massacre not contained in the newspapers consulted.[1]

Issues were missing in collections of some of the newspapers. The *Massachusetts Spy*, begun by Isaiah Thomas in July, 1770,[2] lacked issues between then and November, 1770, and again for 1775. With the exception of two widely scattered issues, the *New York Post-Boy* was not available from April 9, 1770, until April 8, 1771. Prior to May 25, 1772, all issues but one were missing, and issues for March and April, 1773, were not available. Excepting April 9 and May 29, all issues of the South Carolina Gazette were missing for 1775. Although the missing issues leave gaps in a study of these particular newspapers, they presented little problem for this investigation. Full availability of other newspapers in the same colonies provided sufficient material for my purposes.

All issues were not examined over the full period. Instead, coverage of each aspect of the story (event, trials, commemorations) was followed in the Boston papers until it broke. Then using the diffusion times in Andrew as a guide, pickup of accounts in newspapers of the other colonies was located and followed until it broke.[3]

Some problems arose as a result. Coverage in the Boston and other Massachusetts papers was nearly continuous from the time the first stories appeared until coverage broke. Outside Massachusetts, however, coverage became increasingly erratic as distance increased. Printers either grouped stories from several Boston sources of different dates in a single issue, or they skipped an issue or two for want of space or material. To offset this, all newspapers outside Massachusetts were searched for at least a month beyond the break in initial coverage for further articles which had appeared in Boston.

Intervening periods were searched differently.

Where research into the other communications channels revealed reference to the Massacre outside the basic time frame of the newspaper study, newspapers were searched for evidence of it. Several major newspaper stories were thus uncovered by this method of purposive sampling. They are identified in the text, and their diffusion was traced.

Three methods of tracing news stories to their source were used. In many cases the printers simply identified the source by name. Major stories of a column or more, such as the original accounts of the Massacre itself, were compared on nearly a word-for-word basis. Minor stories, ranging from a sentence to several paragraphs, were traced through the habit of the colonial printer of heading his stories with a dateline from their source city. Since there was limited duplication of printing days among the Boston papers, the source was narrowed to one or two. Where two newspapers printed on the same day, comparisons were made. Sufficient differences existed in stories emanating from the incident itself and the trial period to allow positive identification of the source in almost all cases. During the period of annual commemorations, however, such close similarities existed in articles appearing in the Boston press on the same day that it was only possible to narrow the source to two papers.[4]

Thomas R. Adams' bibliography of American

Revolutionary pamphlets, American Independence: Growth of an Idea, forms the basis for identification and diffusion of pamphlets and sermons about the Boston Massacre. In preparing his bibliography, Adams consulted ten other bibliographies including Charles Evans' American Bibliography. His criteria for selection of pamphlets met my requirements--that they be:

1) American in origin.

2) Political, dealing with the main issue of the political relationship between the colonies and Great Britain.

3) Concerned with issues or events leading to the War for Independence.

His selection also included sermons and orations, which were printed as pamphlets subsequent to delivery, and "discussed at length or were stimulated by a major event such as repeal of the Stamp Act, Boston Massacre, or the Battle of Lexington and Concord." He eliminated sermons which were "essentially religious" in nature or "contained only brief reference to politics."[5]

Adams' listings were checked against those of Bernard Bailyn and Merrill Jensen, and Roger P. Bristol's updating of Evans. All titles in Adams for the years of the study plus titles in the other references, not duplicated by Adams, were located and examined on microcard in Clifford K. Shipton's microcard edition of Evans.[6]

Three collections of Revolutionary sermons were also examined as additional sources for sermons. Thus, sermons forming a part of this study were either reproduced as pamphlets, for which a Shipton microcard imprint exists, or printed in the noted collections.[7]

Of 130 titles in Adams for the period only four were not available. Of these one (A Fair Account of the Late Unhappy Disturbance at Boston . . .) made direct reference to the Massacre. Although it could not be examined, sufficient references to it exist in other sources for it to be included. The others were not examined. Thirty pamphlets were found which made either direct or oblique reference to the Massacre. Titles are listed in Appendix B. Of these Adams contained all but two.[8]

Evidence for pamphlet diffusion comes from both Adams' newspaper search and my own. For the period, he examined at least two and sometimes three newspapers, published in the colonies comprising this study, for instances of advertising and reprinting of pamphlets or their contents. As earlier explained, my research included an examination of all newspapers at the time appropriate for appearance of a pamphlet. This included advertising. I found no important differences from Adams.[9]

Newspapers, pamphlets, and secondary sources formed the basis for evidence of committee of correspondence interest in the Massacre. Since this thesis is a study of

Three collections of Revolutionary sermons were also examined as additional sources for sermons. Thus, sermons forming a part of this study were either reproduced as pamphlets, for which a Shipton-Mooney imprint exists, or printed in the noted collections.[7]

Of 150 titles in Adams for the period only four were not available. Of these one (*A Fair Account of the Late Unhappy Disturbance at Boston . . .*) made direct reference to the Massacre. Although it could not be examined, sufficient references to it exist in other sources for it to be included. The others were not examined. Thirty pamphlets were found which made either direct or oblique references to the Massacre. Titles are listed in Appendix B. Of these Adams contained all but two.[8]

Evidence for pamphlet diffusion comes from both Adams' newspaper search and my own. For the period, he examined at least two and sometimes three newspapers published in the colonies comprising this study, for instances of advertising and reprinting of pamphlets or their contents. As earlier explained, my research included an examination of all newspapers at the time appropriate for appearance of a pamphlet. This included advertising. I found no important differences from Adams.[9]

Newspapers, pamphlets, and secondary sources formed the basis for evidence of committee of correspondence interest in the Massacre. Since this thesis is a study of public communications means, internal letters of committees were not included. They are considered interpersonal, thus falling outside the scope of this study.

Sophisticated methods of content analysis were not used in categorizing communications by political position. In that day of partisan writing, and particularly in Massacre accounts, political sides "smack the reader in the eye." Whig sources consistently referred to the event as the "horrid Massacre," blamed the soldiers, demanded "blood for blood" vengeance, and accused the British of purposely creating an atmosphere in which the Massacre became inevitable. Tories blamed the town for inciting a riot, general lawlessness in the colony, looked upon the soldiers as the real victims, and consistently acknowledged Crown authority. A neutral account--there were some--reported facts as known without polemical embellishment. Data have been quantified, in some cases, to show, in tabular form, amount and distribution of information about the Massacre.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX A

[1] Brigham, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, pp. 67, 397, 532; Vol. II, p. 993. The German newspapers were *Die Germantowner Zeitung* and *Die Wochenlichte Staatsbote*.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 319-20.

[3] Andrew, "News Dissemination," pp. 111, 117.

[4] For purposes of this study, the term "original accounts," applied to colonial newspapers, means stories which did not derive from other newspapers.

[5] Adams, *Bibliography*, pp. xi-xviii.

[6] Bailyn, *Pamphlets*; Merrill Jensen, *Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967); Roger P. Bristol, *Supplement to Charles Evans' American Bibliography* (Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 1970); Clifford K. Shipton and James E. Mooney, *National Index of American Imprints through 1800, The Short-Title Evans* (2 vols.; Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society and Barre Publishers, 1969). Adams, Bristol, Bailyn, and Shipton were all working on pamphlets and colonial imprints at the same time. They had access to and cross-checked their individual listings with each other. Of Adams' work, Bailyn says it is "authoritative." Bailyn, *Pamphlets*, p. xi.

[7] Thornton, *Pulpit*; Baldwin, *Clergy*; Potter, *Idiom*. Additional sermons dealing with the Massacre, which were not printed, are discussed in the text.

[8] Titles not examined, with their numbers as listed in Adams, are: John Zubly, *Calm and Respected Thoughts . . .* (89); John Randolph, *Considerations on the Present State of Virginia* (133); John Burgoyne, *The Speech of a General Officer . . .* (155). Baldwin, *Clergy*, p. 113, provided reference to Cooke's sermon, and Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, p. 270, referred to Parson's. For this study direct reference means any pamphlet or sermon occasioned by the Massacre or which discusses it in some detail with identification of it. Oblique reference means allusion to symbols associated with the Massacre in discussion of other topics, e.g., in discussion of consequences of standing

armies use of such words or phrases as "murders," "blood in the streets," etc.

[9] Adams, <u>Bibliography</u>, p. xv.

APPENDIX B

BOSTON MASSACRE PAMPHLETS

This list is arranged by year of first printing in America. In parentheses following each entry, letter "D" identifies a direct reference to the Massacre, letter "O" an oblique. The number is that assigned to the pamphlet by Thomas R. Adams in his bibliography, *American Independence: The Growth of an Idea*. Titles have been shortened somewhat by deletion of superfluous words. Enough is retained to insure accurate identification.

1770

A Short Narrative Of The Horrid Massacre in Boston . . . the Fifth Day of March, 1770, By Soldiers of the XXXIX Regiment . . . . Boston, 1770. (D, 75)

Additional Observations To A Short Narrative of The Horrid Massacre in Boston . . . . Boston, 1770. (D, 75i)

A Fair Account Of The Late Unhappy Disturbance At Boston in New England . . . With an Appendix Containing . . . Evidences . . . not mentioned in the Narrative . . . . London, 1770. (D, 77) Although never printed in America, this pamphlet circulated in Massachusetts during 1770.

Johnson, Stephen. *Integrity and Piety the best Principles of a good Administration of Government . . . A Sermon Preached Before The General Assembly Of The Colony of Connecticut . . . May 10, 1770 . . . .* New London, 1770. (O, 78)

Chauncey, Charles. *Trust in God, the Duty of a People in a Day of Trouble. A Sermon Preached, May 30th, 1770 . . . .* Boston, 1770. (D, 76)

Cooke, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge, in the audience of his honor, Thomas Hutchinson, Esq; Lieutenant-Governor and Commander in Chief . . . May 30th, 1770 . . . .* Boston, 1770. (O, no Adams)

Proceedings Of His Majesty's Council Of The Province Of Massachusetts-Bay, Relative To The Deposition of Andrew Oliver, Esq . . . in Consequence of the unhappy Affair of the 5th of March, 1770. Boston, 1770. (D, 80)

The Trial of . . . Soldiers in his Majesty's 29th Regiment of Foot For the Murder . . . On Monday-Evening, the 5th of March, 1770 . . . . Boston, 1770. (D, 84)

1771

Lathrop, John. *Innocent Blood Crying To God From The Streets Of Boston. A Sermon Occasioned By The Horrid Murder . . . On The Fifth Of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1771. (D, 79)

Lovell, James. *An Oration Delivered April 2d, 1771 . . . To Commemorate the bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1771. (D, 85)

1772

The Votes and Proceedings Of The Freeholders and other Inhabitants Of The Town of Boston, In Town Meeting assembled . . . . Boston, [1772]. (D, 87)

Warren, Joseph. *An Oration Delivered March 5th, 1772 . . . To Commemorate The Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth Of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1772. (D, 88)

1773

[Allen, John] *The American Alarm, Or The Bostonian Plea, For The Rights, and Liberties, of the People . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 90)

[Allen, John] *An Oration Upon the Beauties of Liberty . . . Or the Essential Rights of the Americans . . .* . Boston, 1773. (O, 91)

Church, Benjamin. *An Oration Delivered March Fifth, 1773 . . . To Commemorate the Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth Of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 94)

Howard, Simeon. *A Sermon Preached To The Ancient And Honorable Artillery-Company, In Boston . . . June 7th, 1773 . . .* . Boston, 1773. (O, 95)

Proceedings Of His Majesty's Council Of The Province Of Massachusetts-Bay, Relative To The Deposition of Andrew Oliver, Esq . . . In Consequence of the unhappy Affair of the 5th of March, 1770. Boston, 1770. (D, 80)

The Trial of . . . Soldiers in his Majesty's 29th Regiment of Foot For the Murder . . . On Monday-Evening, the 5th of March, 1770 . . . . Boston, 1770. (D, 84)

1771

Lathrop, John. *Innocent Blood Crying to God From The Streets Of Boston. A Sermon Occasioned by the Horrid Murder . . . On the Fifth of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1771. (D, 75)

Lovell, James. *An Oration Delivered April 2d, 1771 . . . To Commemorate the Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1771. (D, 85)

1772

The Votes and Proceedings Of The Freeholders and other Inhabitants Of The Town of Boston, In Town Meeting assembled . . . . Boston, [1772]. (D, 87)

Warren, Joseph. *An Oration Delivered March 5th, 1772 . . . To Commemorate The Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth Of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1772. (D, 88)

1773

[Allen, John] *The American Alarm, Or The Bostonian Plea, For The Rights, and Liberties, of the People . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 90)

[Allen, John] *An Oration Upon the Beauties of Liberty . . . Or the Essential Rights of the Americans . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 91)

Church, Benjamin. *An Oration Delivered March Fifth, 1773 . . . To Commemorate the Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth Of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 94)

Howard, Simeon. *A Sermon Preached To The Ancient And Honorable Artillery-Company, In Boston . . . June 7th, 1773 . . .* . Boston, 1773. (D, 95)

The Representations of Governor Hutchinson and Others . . . together with the Resolves of the two Houses thereon. Boston, 1773. (O, 96)

1774

A Brief Review Of The Rise And Progress, Services and Sufferings, Of New England, Especially The Province of Massachuset's-Bay . . . . Norwich, 1774. (O, 104)

[Drayton, William Henry] *A Letter From A Freeman of South Carolina, To The Deputies of North America . . .* . Charles-Town, S. C., 1774. (O, 111)

Parsons, Jonathan. *Freedom from Civil and Ecclesiastical Slavery, the Purchase of Christ . . .* . NewBury-Port, 1774. (D, no Adams)

Hancock, John. *An Oration; Delivered March 5, 1774 . . . To Commemorate The Bloody Tragedy of the Fifth of March 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1774. (D, 117)

Lathrop, John. *A Sermon Preached To The Ancient and Honorable Artilery-Company In Boston . . . June 6th, 1774 . . .* . Boston, 1774. (D, 122)

[Lee, Arthur] *A True State of The Proceedings In the Parliament of Great Britain, And In The Province of Massachusetts Bay . . .* . Philadelphia, 1774. (D, 124)

Quincy, Josiah. *Observations On The Act Of Parliament Commonly Called The Boston Port-Bill, With Thoughts On . . . Standing Armies . . .* . Boston, 1774. (O, 132)

1775

Warren, Joseph. *An Oration Delivered March Sixth, 1775 . . . To Commemorate the Bloody Tragedy Of The Fifth of March, 1770 . . .* . Boston, 1775. (D, 201)

Bolton, Thomas. *An Oration Delivered March Fifteenth, 1775, At The Request of a Number of the Inhabitants Of The Town Of Boston . . .* . [Boston] 1775. (D, 153)

The Representations of Governor Hutchinson and others . . . . Together with the Resolves of the two Houses Thereon. Boston, 1773. (O, 96)

1774

A Brief Review of The Rise And Progress, Services and Sufferings, Of New England, Especially The Province of Massachusetts-Bay . . . . Norwich, 1774. (O, 104)

[Drayton, William Henry] *A Letter From A Freeman of South Carolina, To The Deputies of North America . . . .* Charles-Town, S. C., 1774. (O, 111)

Parsons, Jonathan. *Freedom from Civil and Ecclesiastical Slavery, the Purchase of Christ . . . .* Newbury-Port, 1774. (B, no Adams)

Hancock, John. *An Oration; Delivered March 5, 1774 . . . . To Commemorate The Bloody Tragedy of the Fifth of March 1770 . . . .* Boston, 1774. (B, 117)

Lathrop, John. *A Sermon Preached To The Ancient and Honorable Artillery-Company In Boston . . . June 6th, 1774 . . . .* Boston, 1774. (B, 112)

[Lee, Arthur] *A True State of The Proceedings In the Parliament of Great Britain, And In the Province of Massachusetts Bay . . . .* Philadelphia, 1774. (B, 124)

Quincy, Josiah. *Observations On The Act Of Parliament Commonly Called The Boston Port-Bill; With Thoughts On . . . Standing Armies . . . .* Boston, 1774. (O, 133)

1775

Warren, Joseph. *An Oration Delivered March Sixth, 1775 . . . To Commemorate the Bloody Tragedy of The Fifth of March, 1770 . . . .* Boston, 1775. (B, 201)

Bolton, Thomas. *An Oration Delivered March Fifteenth, 1775, At the Request of a Number of the Inhabitants Of The Town Of Boston . . . .* [Boston] 1775. (B, 159)

Noble, Oliver. *Some Strictures Upon The Sacred Story Recorded In The Book Of Esther . . . In A Discourse Delivered At Newbury-Port . . . In Commemoration Of The Massacre At Boston . . . .* Newbury-Port, 1775. (D, 187)

[Mein, John] *Sagittarius's Letters and Political Speculations extracted From the Public Ledger . . . .* Boston, 1775. (O, 183)

[Leonard, Daniel] *The Origin Of The American Contest With Great-Britain, Or The Present Political State of the Massachusetts-Bay . . . .* New York, 1775. (D, 180)

No Standing Army In The British Colonies: Or An Address To The Inhabitants Of The New-York, Against Unlawful Standing Armies. New York, 1775. (O, 186)

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books and Collected Works

Adams, Charles F. *The Works of John Adams*. 10 vols. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1856.

Butterfield, Lyman H. (ed.). *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Cunningham, Anne R. (ed.). *Letters and Diary of John Rowe*. Boston: W. B. Clarke Company, 1903.

Cushing, Harry A. (ed.). *The Writings of Samuel Adams*. 4 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Drayton, John. *Memoirs of the American Revolution, From its Commencement to the Year 1776, Inclusive; as relating to The State of South-Carolina.* 2 vols. Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1821.

Hutchinson, Thomas. *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*. Edited by L. S. Mayo. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Jensen, Merrill, comp. *Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.

Kidder, Frederic. *History of the Boston Massacre, March 5, 1770*. Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell, 1870.

Niles, Hezekiah (ed.). *Principles and Acts of the American Revolution*. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1876.

Quincy, Josiah. *Memoir of the Life of Josiah Quincy, Junior of Massachusetts Bay: 1744-1775*. 3d. ed. Edited by Eliza Susan Quincy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1875.

Ramsey, David. *The History of the American Revolution*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: R. Aitkens & Son, 1789.

Thomas, Isaiah. *The History of Printing in America*. 2d. ed. 2 vols. Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell, 1874.

Thornton, John W. *The Pulpit of the American Revolution*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1860.

Wroth, L. Kinvin & Zobel, Hiller B. (eds.). *The Legal Papers of John Adams.* Vol. III. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Pamphlets

Carmichael, John. *A Self-Defensive War Lawful, Proved In A Sermon, Preached at Lancaster, before Captain Ross's Company of Militia . . . June 4th, 1775*. Lancaster, Pa., 1775.

[Jefferson], Thomas. *A Summary View Of The Rights Of British America, Set Forth In Some Resolutions Intended For The Inspection of The Present Delegates Of The People of Virginia . . . .* Williamsburg, Va., [1774].

A Letter From A Virginian, To The Members of the Congress To Be Held At Philadelphia . . . . [New York], 1774.

Sherwood, Samuel. *A Sermon Containing Scriptural Instructions to Civil Rulers, and All Free-born Subjects . . . Also, An Appendix, Stating the Heavy Grievances the Colonies Labor Under . . . By the Rev. Ebenezer Baldwin of Danbury*. New Haven, Conn. [1774].

Newspapers

The Boston Chronicle

The Boston Evening-Post

The Boston-Gazette and Country Journal

The Essex Gazette

The Essex Journal and Merrimack Packet: Or, the Massachusetts and New-Hampshire General Advertiser.

The Massachusetts Gazette: and the Boston Post-Boy and Advertiser.

The Massachusetts Gazette: and the Boston Weekly News-Letter.

The Massachusetts Spy Or, Thomas's Boston Journal.

The Harbottle Dorr Collection of Annotated Massachusetts Newspapers, 1765-1776.

The Connecticut Courant.

The Connecticut Journal, and New-Haven Post-Boy.

The New-London Gazette.

The New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury.

The New-York Gazette: or, the Weekly Post-Boy.

The New-York Journal: or the Weekly Advertiser.

Rivington's New-York Gazetteer: or the Connecticut, (New-Jersey), Hudson's-River, and Quebec Weekly Advertiser.

The Pennsylvania Chronicle, and Universal Advertiser.

The Pennsylvania Evening-Post.

The Pennsylvania Gazette.

The Pennsylvania Journal: and the Weekly Advertiser.

The Pennsylvania Ledger: or, the Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, & New-Jersey Weekly Advertiser.

The Pennsylvania Packet: and the General Advertiser.

The Virginia Gazette (Alexander Purdie and John Dixon).

The Virginia Gazette (William Rind).

The Virginia Gazette (Alexander Purdie).

The Virginia Gazette, or the Norfolk Intelligencer.

South Carolina and American General Gazette.

The South-Carolina Gazette.

The South-Carolina Gazette and Country Journal.

Secondary Sources

Bibliographies

Adams, Thomas R. American Independence: The Growth of an Idea. Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press, 1965.

Brigham, Clarence. History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820. 2 vols. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1947.

Bristol, Roger P. Supplement to Charles Evans' American Bibliography. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1970.

Evans, Charles. American Bibliography. 14 vols. New York: Peter Smith, 1941. Vols. 13 and 14 by Clifford K. Shipton.

Shipton, Clifford K. and Mooney, James E. National Index of American Imprints through 1800. The Short-Title Evans. 2 vols. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1969.

Books

Adams, James T. Revolutionary New England. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923.

Andrews, Charles M. The Colonial Background of the American Revolution. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1931.

Bailyn, Bernard. Ideological Origins of the American Revolution. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967.

_______ (ed.). Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965.

Baldwin, Alice M. The New England Clergy and the American Revolution. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1928.

The South-Carolina Gazette.

The South-Carolina Gazette and Country Journal.

Secondary Sources

Bibliographies

Adams, Thomas R. *American Independence: The Growth of an Idea.* Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press, 1965.

Brigham, Clarence. *History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820.* 2 vols. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1947.

Bristol, Roger P. *Supplement to Charles Evans' American Bibliography.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1970.

Evans, Charles. *American Bibliography.* 14 vols. New York: Peter Smith, 1941. Vols. 13 and 14 by Clifford K. Shipton.

Shipton, Clifford K. and Mooney, James E. *National Index of American Imprints Through 1800. The Short-Title Evans.* 2 vols. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1969.

Books

Adams, James T. *Revolutionary New England.* Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923.

Andrews, Charles M. *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1931.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution.* Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967.

________ (ed.). *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776.* Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965.

Baldwin, Alice M. *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1928.

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. John Adams and the American Revolution. Boston: Little, Brown and Company and Atlantic Monthly Press, 1950.

Breed, William P. Presbyterians and the Revolution. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publishers, 1876.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776. 1st. ed. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Brigham, Clarence S. Paul Revere's Engravings. New York: Atheneum, 1969.

Brown, Richard D. Revolutionary Politics in Massachusetts: The Boston Committee of Correspondence and the Towns, 1772-1774. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Cary, John. Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.

Dabney, William M. and Dargan, Marion. William Henry Drayton & the American Revolution. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1962.

Davidson, Philip. Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Drake, Samuel A. Old Boston Taverns and Tavern Clubs. Boston: W. A. Butterfield, 1917.

Emery, Edwin. The Press and America. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962.

Flick, Hugh M. Whig and Tory. Vol. III of The History of the State of New York. Edited by Alexander C. Flick. 10 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Frothingham, Richard. Life and Times of Joseph Warren. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865.

Hansen, Harry. The Boston Massacre. New York: Hastings House, 1970.

Heimert, Alan E. Religion and the American Mind. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. *John Adams and the American Revolution.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company and Atlantic Monthly Press, 1950.

Breed, William P. *Presbyterians and the Revolution.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publishers. 1876.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776.* 1st. ed. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Brigham, Clarence S. *Paul Revere's Engravings.* New York: Atheneum, 1969.

Brown, Richard D. *Revolutionary Politics in Massachusetts: The Boston Committee of Correspondence and the Towns, 1772-1774.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Cary, John. *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.

Dabney, William M. and Dargan, Marion. *William Henry Drayton & the American Revolution.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1962.

Davidson, Philip. *Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Drake, Samuel A. *Old Boston Taverns and Tavern Clubs.* Boston: W. A. Butterfield, 1917.

Emery, Edwin. *The Press and America.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962.

Flick, Hugh M. *Whig and Tory.* Vol. III of *The History of the State of New York.* Edited by Alexander C. Flick. 10 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Frothingham, Richard. *Life and Times of Joseph Warren.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865.

Hansen, Harry. *The Boston Massacre.* New York: Hastings House, 1970.

Heimert, Alan E. *Religion and the American Mind.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Jensen, Merrill. *The Founding of a Nation: A History of the American Revolution, 1763-1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

________. *The New Nation*. Vintage Books. Caravelle ed. New York: Random House, 1950.

Kobre, Sidney. *The Development of the Colonial Newspaper*. Pittsburgh: Colonial Press, 1944.

Lynd, Staughton. *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*. Vintage Books. New York: Random House, 1969.

Marsh, D. L. and Clark, W. H. *The Story of Massachusetts*. 4 vols. New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1938.

McCrady, Edward. *The History of South Carolina under the Royal Government, 1719-1776*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899.

Miller, John C. *Sam Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Birth of the Republic, 1763-1789*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Newcomer, Lee N. *The Embattled Farmers*. Columbia University, New York: King's Crown Press, 1953.

Potter, David and Thomas, Gordon L. (eds.). *The Colonial Idiom*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Ringwalt, John L. *Development of Transportation Systems in the United States*. Philadelphia: By the Author, Railway World Office, 1881.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *Prelude to Independence: The Newspaper War on Britain, 1764-1776*. Vintage Books, New York: Random House, 1957.

Shipton, Clifford K. *Isaiah Thomas*. Rochester, N. Y.: The Printing House of Leo Hart, 1948.

Shy, John. *Toward Lexington*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Smith, Page. *John Adams*. 2 vols. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1962.

Thwing, Annie H. The Crooked and Narrow Streets of the Town of Boston, 1630-1822. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1920.

Warden, G. B. Boston, 1689-1776. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.

Wells, William V. The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1866.

Zobel, Hiller B. The Boston Massacre. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970.

Articles

Alden, John E. "John Mein: Scourge of Patriots," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Publications, XXXIV (1937-1942), 571-99.

Bailyn, Bernard. "Religion and Revolution: Three Biographical Studies," Perspectives in American History, IV (1970), 85-169.

Calkin, Homer L. "Pamphlets and Public Opinion during the American Revolution," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXIV (1940), 22-42.

Collins, E. D. "Committees of Correspondence of the American Revolution," American Historical Association Report for 1901, I (1901), 143-71.

Frothingham, Richard. "The Sam Adams Regiments in the Town of Boston," Atlantic Monthly, July, 1863, pp. 595-616.

Maier, Pauline. "John Wilkes and American Disillusionment with Britain," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d. ser., XX (July, 1963), 373-95.

Mott, Frank Luther. "The Newspaper Coverage of Lexington and Concord," New England Quarterly, XVII (December, 1944), 489-505.

Pomerantz, Sidney. "The Patriot Newspapers and the American Revolution," The Era of the American Revolution. Edited by Richard B. Morris. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. "The Colonial Newspapers and the Stamp Act," New England Quarterly, VIII (March, 1935), 63-83.

________. "Propaganda and the Boston Newspaper Press, 1767-1770," Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Publications, XXXII (1937), 396-416.

Tate, Thad. "The Coming of the Revolution in Virginia: Britain's Challenge to Virginia's Ruling Class, 1763-1776," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d. ser., XIX (July, 1962), 323-43.

Van Tyne, C. H. "Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces, on the American Revolution," American Historical Review, XIX (October, 1913-July, 1914), 44-64.

Wood, Gordon S. "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d. ser., (January, 1966), 3-32.

Zobel, Hiller B. "Newer Light on the Boston Massacre," American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, LXXVIII.I (1968), 119-28.

Unpublished Works

Andrew, George S., Jr. "News Dissemination in Colonial America, 1745-1775." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Teeter, Dwight L. "A Legacy of Expression: Philadelphia Newspapers and Congress during the War for Independence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Yodelis, Mary Ann P. "Boston's Second Paper War: Economics, Politics, and the Theory and Practice of Political Expression in the Press, 1763-1775." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. "The Colonial Newspapers and the Stamp Act," *New England Quarterly*, VIII (March, 1935), 63-83.

________. "Propaganda and the Boston Newspaper Press, 1767-1770." Colonial Society of Massachusetts. *Publications*, XXXII (1937), 396-416.

Tate, Thad. "The Coming of the Revolution in Virginia: Britain's Challenge to Virginia's Ruling Class, 1763-1776," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., XIX (July, 1962), 323-43.

Van Tyne, C. H. "Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces, on the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XIX (October, 1913-July, 1914), 44-64.

Wood, Gordon S. "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., (January, 1966), 3-32.

Zobel, Hiller B. "Newer Light on the Boston Massacre," American Antiquarian Society *Proceedings*, LXXVIII.1 (1968), 119-39.

Unpublished Works

Andrews, George L., Jr. "News Dissemination in Colonial America, 1765-1775." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Teeter, Dwight L. "A Legacy of Expression: Philadelphia Newspapers and Congress during the War for Independence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Yodelis, Mary Ann Y. "Boston's Second Major Paper War: Economics, Politics, and the Theory and Practice of Political Expression in the Press, 1763-1775." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Thesis 131798
S5984 Smith
What came after?
News diffusion and
significance of the
Boston massacre in
six American colonies,
1770-1775.